

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

NOV 27 1940

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BÜHLER, CURT F.—Lydgate's 'Horse, Sheep and Goose' and Huntington MS HM 144,	563
STOLL, E. E.—Modesty in the Audience,	570
KLEINSCHMIDT, J. R.—The Date of the 'Cid' in English,	575
HUTTON, JAMES.—Three Notes on French Authors: Desportes, Guérault, Ronsard,	579
WOODBIDGE, B. M.—Ronsseau and Faust,	581
BIRD, C. W.—Three Sources of Vigny's 'Journal,'	583
BAKER, CARLOS.—A Note on Shelley and Milton,	585
RALPH, P. L.—References to the Drama in the Mildmay Diary,	589
LUMIANSKY, R. M.—Milton's English Again,	591
SLEDD, JAMES.—'Hause' and 'Slaves' in 'King Lear,'	594
MAGOUN, F. P., JR.—On Six Old-Icelandic Words,	598
STURTEVANT, A. M.—Gothic <i>pis</i> : <i>pis-ei</i> , -uh; <i>hvis</i> : <i>hvis-uh</i> ; <i>anparis</i> : <i>anparis-uh</i> , etc.,	599
LAIRD, CHARLETON.—A Fourteenth Century Scribe,	601
SAVAGE, HENRY L.—A Note on 'Sir Gawain' 1795,	604
CROSBY, H. L., JR.—Two Notes on 'Beowulf,'	605

REVIEWS.—

J. M. MANLY and EDITH RICKERT, The Text of the <i>Canterbury Tales</i> . [Carleton Brown.]	606
A. GRÉGOIRE, Edmond—Puxi—Michel. [H. F. Muller.]	621
H. J. GREEN (ed.), <i>Ansejfs de Mes</i> . [Leo Spitzer.]	624
LUIGI DI BENEDETTO (ed.), <i>Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo</i> . [C. S. Singleton.]	626
H. GERSTNER und K. SCHWORM (eds.), <i>Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit</i> . [E. E. Miller.]	628
J. G. ROBERTSON, <i>Lessing's Dramatic Theory</i> . [R. B. Roulston.]	630
W. W. GREG (ed.), <i>Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile</i> . [J. G. McManaway.]	632
P. PHELPS MORAND, The effects of his political life on John Milton; <i>De Comus à Satan</i> . [E. M. W. Tillyard.]	635
WILLIAM IRVINE, <i>Walter Bagehot</i> . [E. B. Burgum.]	636
R. A. E. BROOKS (ed.), <i>Thomas Carlyle, Journey to Germany</i> . [Hill Shine.]	638
J. A. S. MCPHEE, <i>Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain</i> . [James Hutton.]	639

BRIEF MENTION: MARY BEARE, The German Popular Play "Atis" and the Venetian Opera; H. TEN E. PERRY, Masters of Dramatic Comedy and Their Social Themes; R. H. BARKER, Mr Cibber of Drury Lane; R. H. BOWERS (ed.), <i>The Guest of Gy</i> ,	640
--	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakia, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Footnotes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JÖGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PART IV, THE PERIOD OF RACINE
1673—1700

By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Professor of French Literature in the Johns Hopkins University

In two volumes, 996 pages, cloth, \$10

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

PEDRO SALINAS TRUTH OF TWO AND OTHER POEMS

Translations by ELEANOR L. TURNBULL

This volume consists of translations and original texts selected from the last two volumes of Señor Salinas' poems, which are generally considered by the critics to be his finest work. There are fifty-nine poems from *La voz a ti debida*, a great love sequence, and twenty poems from *Razón de amor*, the most profoundly lyrical of his books.

ix + 289 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$2.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Editors
on the
script
articles
to the
les of
Quo-
3, not
MP.,
editors
business

two
to
eat
cal

Modern Language Notes

Volume LV

DECEMBER, 1940

Number 8

LYDGATE'S *HORSE, SHEEP AND GOOSE* AND HUNTINGTON MS. HM 144

Of Lydgate's shorter poems, the *Horse, Sheep and Goose* seems to have been one of the most popular in its own day. No fewer than a dozen manuscripts of this text as well as five editions printed in the fifteenth century are known to us. Although the poem has been critically edited a number of times,¹ the text preserved in the Huntington MS. HM 144 was not consulted for these editions. A note on this text will not, I think, be found unwelcome.

The text in the Huntington manuscript occupies folios 140^v to 144^r; these lines correspond to stanzas 43 through 77 of MacCracken's edition. Following at the end of the poem, there are seven further stanzas in the same hand while a different, though contemporary, hand has added still another.

The merest glance at the variant readings shows that the text in the Huntington manuscript is closely related to that in the printed editions; every variant reading peculiar to the printed editions is also found in the Huntington text. Furthermore the seven stanzas on folio 144 are peculiar to the Huntington manuscript and the printed texts; no other manuscript containing these stanzas is known. If, then, the manuscript actually belongs to the decade (1460-70) assigned to it by F. J. Furnivall and Carleton Brown,²

¹ F. J. Furnivall, *Political, Religious and Love Poems (EETS., O. S. 15, pp. 15-22, and revised edition, pp. 15-42)*; M. Degenhart, *Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie* (Heft xix, Leipzig, 1900); H. N. MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate (EETS., O. S. 192, pp. 539-66)*. For the kind gift of a set of photostats and permission to quote from them, I am obliged to the authorities of the Henry E. Huntington Library.

² Furnivall, *Notes and Queries, Fifth Series*, ix. 342; Brown, *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse*, Oxford, 1916-20, i, 472.

it cannot, of course, be a copy of a book printed in 1477. It is equally apparent, though, that this was not the manuscript used by Caxton as it lacks the first 42 stanzas found in the printed text; this omission cannot be the result of a simple lacuna in the manuscript as the poem begins on the verso of a leaf, the recto of which contains the closing lines of Lydgate's *Churl and the Bird*. Under these circumstances the only possible explanation is that the Huntington manuscript was transcribed from the same one used by Caxton or from some "sister-manuscript" of this which also may have lacked the first 42 stanzas. There is, however, no textual evidence to show that the Huntington manuscript derives from any other source than Caxton or his original. In only twelve cases do the Huntington (H) and Caxton (C) texts differ, ten of which are of no importance whatsoever.³ The only real differences occur in lines 521 and 533. In the first case, the two texts respectively read:

And though one be more than another stronge (C)
And though one be weke and another stronge (H)

As no other manuscript has the reading of the Huntington text, it is probable that we are here dealing with nothing more than a scribal emendation. In line 533, the texts read:

As thus all vertues allone hath not one man (C)
And thus all vertues allone hathe not one man (H)

Whether these variant readings indicate that the Huntington manuscript derives from a different source than the early printed editions may be seriously doubted. The variations are so slight that they can hardly be more than scribal errors and emendations.

On the other hand, if the dating of the manuscript is wrong and if it be supposed that it was actually written after 1477,⁴ a further possibility presents itself; namely that the Huntington manuscript

³ Line 331, comparison C *and* paryson H; l. 349, considere C *and* cosidere H; l. 380, His C *and* Hi H; l. 399, that pees C *and* pees H; l. 413, thy C *and* the H; l. 434, defenden C *and* defend H; l. 454, spekes C *and* apokes H; l. 468, recoure C *and* recouer H; l. 478, in to C *and* in H; l. 504, hem at C *and* hem H. Although lines 426-7 were originally transposed, this was corrected by the scribe.

⁴ I am obliged to the manuscript department of the Huntington Library for pointing out that Prof. Manly dated the MS., though without giving specific reasons, as 1480-1500 (*The Text of The Canterbury Tales*, I, 291). The present paper, therefore, helps to confirm Prof. Manly's dating.

was copied from a printed edition. Of the five fifteenth-century editions, those printed by Wynkyn de Worde may be eliminated at once; that the Huntington manuscript was not copied from these is clear since all three lack stanzas 67 through 77 which are included in the Huntington text.⁵ The whole problem therefore resolves itself into the question: was the Huntington manuscript copied from a Caxton edition and, if so, from which one? Three significant points seem to indicate that the manuscript was copied from the printed book. First of all, the text in the Huntington manuscript comprises the contents of the second quire in the Caxton edition; in short, it may be argued that the scribe transcribed his text from a copy that had lost the whole of the first quire. In the second place, the interlinear, rather than marginal, explanations are somewhat more characteristic of printed books than of manuscripts. Lastly, and perhaps the most significant of all, is the evidence afforded by a single line (537). Here the Caxton editions and the Huntington manuscript agree in the reading:

Yf charyte gouerne well the rother

I think it is clear that a simple misprint ("rother" for "tother") in Caxton's first edition was mechanically copied both by the scribe of the Huntington manuscript and by the compositor who set the text of Caxton's second edition. As it is difficult to believe that the scribe could have independently made the same mistake and in view of the fact that the text wanting in the Huntington manuscript corresponds exactly to the contents of one quire in Caxton's editions, it seems likely that the Huntington manuscript derives from the printed edition rather than from Caxton's original.

It is probable, moreover, that the Huntington manuscript was copied from Caxton's first edition rather than from the second. The orthography in the manuscript compares more nearly to that in the first edition than to that in the second. Furthermore in the

⁵ E. Gordon Duff (*The Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 32) says: "One of these reprints shows how careless a printer W. de Worde was. He reprints the *Horse, the Shepe, and the Ghoos*, from a copy of Caxton's wanting a leaf, but never noticing anything wrong prints straight ahead, making of course nonsense of the whole." As Caxton printed only six stanzas to a leaf and as eleven stanzas are wanting, it is clear that the Caxton copy used by de Worde lacked not one but *two* leaves; these leaves were the fifth and sixth of the second quire.

two instances where the editions differ textually, the manuscript agrees with the first edition in each case. In line 411, the manuscript and the first edition have "circumstaunce" while the second edition has the plural case; in line 455, the same two texts read "Torned" while the second edition has "Torneth."

As both Furnivall and Carleton Brown failed to realize that the additional stanzas were also included in the printed editions of the *Horse, Sheep and Goose*,⁸ these are here reprinted from the manuscript with the variant readings taken from four of the printed editions:

I

- Hit is ful harde to knowe ony estate
 Double visage loketh oute of euery hood
 Sewerte is loste Truste is past the date
 Thrifte hathe take his leue ouer the flood
 5 Lawe can do no thyng withouten good
 Thefte hathe leue to goo oute at large
 Of the communes mysreule hathe take the charge

II

- And thou desire thy self to anaunce
 Poure or riche whether that thou be
 10 Be lowly and gentyl in thy gouernaunce
 Good reule douteles may best preferre the
 Yf thou be gentyl hurte not thy degre
 And thou be poure do alle that thou canne
 To vse goode maners for maner maket[h] man

III

- 15 Atte thy mele be glad in countenaunce
 In mete and drynke be thou mesurable
 Beware of surfete and mysgouernaunce

⁸ The editions are the following: Caxton's first (Duff 261 = 1); Caxton's second (Duff 262 = 2); de Worde's first (Duff 263 = 3); de Worde's second (Duff 264); de Worde's third (Duff 265 = 5). I have been unable to see the only known copy of de Worde's second edition, which is in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire. It may here be pointed out that, though de Worde's first edition follows the Caxton prints very carefully, his third edition contains numerous alternative readings, mostly not very good ones. We may also note that, in line 38 below, the Huntington MS. and de Worde's third edition have the correct reading, while de Worde's first edition follows the misprints of the Caxton editions.

- They cause men ofte to be vnresonable
 Suffre no thyng be sayde at thy table
 20 That ony man may hurte or displese
 For good mete and drynke axeth Joye and ese

IV

- Yf thy goodes to the not suffyse
 Conforme the euer to that thou hast
 Gouverne so thy self in suche a wyse
 25 In thyn expences make no waste
 Grete excesse causeth vnthrift in haste
 Beware be tyme bere this in thyn herte
 Misrewle maketh ofte many men to smerte

V

- Beware of nouellis that be new brought
 30 Though they be plesaunt lokke fast thy lyppe
 An hasty worde may be to sore bought
 Close thy mouthe leste thy tounge trippe
 To thy self loke thou make not a whyppe
 Hurte not thy self lest thou sore rewe
 35 For thyn owne ese keepe thy tonge in mew

VI

- The worlde so wyde the ayre so remeuable
 The sely man so lytel of stature
 The graue and grounde of clothyng so mutable
 The fyre so hoote and subtyll of nature
 40 The water neuer in oon what creature
 That made is of these foure thus flyttyng
 Maye endure stable and perseuere in abydyng

VII

- The further I goo the more behynde
 The more behynde the ner my weyes ende
 45 The more I seche the werse can I fynde
 The lyghter leue the lother for to wende
 The truer I serue the ferther oute of mynde
 Though I goo loose I am teyde with a lyne
 Is hit fortune or Infortune thus I fyne

Explicit

[Different hand]

VIII

- 50 Wo worthe debate þat neuer may haue pease
 Wo worthe penaunce þat askith no pyte
 Wo worthe vengeaunce whiche mercy may not sease
 Wo worthe þat Jugement þat hathe none equite
 Wo worthe þat trouthe þat hathe no charite
 55 Wo worthe þat Juge þat may no gilt[y] saue
 Wo worthe þat right þat may no fauor haue

l. 5 withouten] without 35; l. 14 maner] maners 5; l. 15 mele] mete 5
 countenaunce] contenance 123; l. 16 dryke (*sic*) 3; l. 19 be] to be 5 thy]
 the 5; l. 21 good] god *corrected to* good MS axeth] asketh 5; l. 22 goodes]
 goddes 5; l. 23 Conforme] Conferme 5; l. 28 ofte] *omitted* 5 smerte]
 smarte 3, sterte 5; l. 30 lokke] loke 2; l. 34 Hurte] Hute *corrected to*
 Hurte MS; l. 36 remeuable] remuable 1235; l. 38 grounde of clothyn]
 gound of clotyng 123; l. 39 suptyll (*sic*) 5; l. 41 fletynge 5; l. 48 louse
 35; l. 49 fyne] fynde *corrected to* fyne MS; l. 55 gilt MS.

As the present writer has previously pointed out,⁷ the last stanza (which is not included in the printed editions and which is probably written in a different hand) may also be found in the *Court of Sapience* (stanza 67) and in Ashby's *Active Policy of a Prince* (stanza 99). Although the first five stanzas are very Lydgatian in character, a reasonably careful search has failed to identify them. The remaining two stanzas, as Furnivall and Degenhart have already pointed out, are sometimes called "Halsham's Ballad." These lines have a rather amazing "history" behind them. The first of these stanzas occurs in Lydgate's *A Pageant of Knowledge*, of which both a seven and an eight line version are known to us.⁸ The second forms part of another of Lydgate's poems, being the first stanza of his *Tyed with a Lyne*.⁹ It may also be found as a single stanza in British Museum MS. Addit. 5465, f. 2^v, while the first also occurs alone in MS. Addit. 34360, f. 22^r. The two are found together as "Halsham's Ballad" (Brown 2252)¹⁰ in MS. Harley 7333, f. 148^r, and in MS. Addit. 16165, f. 244^r. Combined with Lydgate's *Stanza on Deceit* (Brown 438) and his *Four Things that make a Man a Fool* (Brown 2693), it appears in Bodleian MS. Fairfax 16, f. 195^r, while in MS. Harley 7578, f. 20^r, these same four stanzas reappear but with Chaucer's *Proverb* (Brown 2510)

⁷ *The Sources of the Court of Sapience*, Leipzig, 1932, p. 87.

⁸ MacCracken, *op. cit.*, p. 730 and p. 734.

⁹ MacCracken, *op. cit.*, p. 832.

¹⁰ The references are to Carleton Brown's *Register etc.*, II.

inserted in the middle. The appearance of the Halsham Ballad in these additional stanzas is merely another example of the extraordinary adaptability of Lydgate's stanzas;¹¹ they could be combined in any number of ways to form a tolerable poem.¹²

CURT F. BÜHLER

The Pierpont Morgan Library

¹¹ The *Stanza on Deceit* comes from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*; compare Brown 438. For other extracts from the *Fall of Princes*, see my paper "A New Lydgate-Chaucer Manuscript," *MLN.*, Jan., 1937, p. 2. At least two other versions of *Four Things that make a Man a Fool* are known (Brown 2271 and 2272). *Four Things* and *Deceit* are combined to form a single poem in MS. 775 of The Pierpont Morgan Library (f. 320^r), though this was not known to Brown or MacCracken. *Four Things* is furthermore added to some stanzas extracted from another poem (Brown 2081) in MS. Harley 2251, f. 150^v, while in MS. R. 3. 19 (f. 205^v) of Trinity College, Cambridge, it forms the second stanza of a poem beginning: "O mosy quince hangyng by your stalke" (compare Speght's *Chaucer*, f. 344^v). It may finally be noted that *Deceit* occurs attached to a stanza on the uncertainties of this world (Brown 2509) in MS. Douce 45, ff. 115^v-116^r.

¹² As I have rejected Helen P. South's contention that Halsham was the real author of the Ballad ("The Question of Halsam," *PMLA.*, L, 362-71), it has been suggested to me that my reasons for this should be made clear. Dr. South based her belief mainly on two factors, namely the testimony of John Shirley and the internal evidence offered by the rhyme in ll. 13-14 of the Ballad. Shirley's attribution is found in MS. Addit. 16165 and is repeated in two manuscripts dependent on Shirley, Harley 7333 and Addit. 34360. It is, however, well-known that Shirley's attributions and texts are not above question. Alternatively, if Shirley is worthy of credence here, it may well be argued that Halsham "made" the Ballad by the simple expedient of borrowing two Lydgate stanzas. Dr. South furthermore believed that MS. Fairfax 16 was the earliest and best MS. of this text. This MS. was, however, recently dated "mid-15th Cent." in the Bodleian *Summary Catalogue* (No. 3896), at which period Shirley was either very old or dead; it may be questioned, then, whether this MS. is older than Addit. 16165. Next it may be noted that in the Fairfax MS. Halsham is not noted as the author and the stanzas are found in conjunction with other Lydgatian lines as noted above. Dr. South believed that the Fairfax text represents the correct version because the rhyme in lines 13-14 is *infortune: Lune* whereas Lydgate's poem is presumed to have *infortune: lyne* (i. e. *line*). It is significant, it seems to me, that in the Shirley MSS., which alone attribute the poem to Halsham, violence is done to the rhyme by the readings *infortune: loyne, loygne, loynne*. On the other

MODESTY IN THE AUDIENCE

Mr. Maurice Evans, in a "mass-interview" at his theatre with 1600 students as reported in the *Herald-Tribune* of December 2, told them that "very young children get profoundly embarrassed by love scenes." He did not say whether this was the case at Shakespeare performances. Certainly there is far more occasion for embarrassment at modern plays, and if children are put out by Shakespeare's love scenes it is because of the way they are now acted. Physical familiarity or intimacy is seldom suggested in the text, and the reason (which I have touched on before¹) is, I think, now more than ever apparent. The Elizabethan spectators were like children (the words "very young" seeming to me superfluous) and would have been embarrassed.

Not that (any more than our children) they were innocent, "sweet-minded," pure in heart. The Elizabethan audience delighted in smutty jokes, and most vigorous youngsters who have not been well guarded and educated do so too. The point is that ordinary healthy human beings, whether children in fact or the children of nature only that the Elizabethans were, do not relish

hand, is it impossible that Lydgate's poem originally also had *lune* and that *lyne* is no more than a graphic variant or scribal error? In the twelve stanzas of the poem as printed by MacCracken, the last word appears as *luyne* no fewer than six times; while *luyne* is a perfectly good form for *lune* (*OED* records *tuyne* for *tune*, *ruyle* for *rule*, *muyle* for *mule*, etc.), it is difficult to see how it could stand for *line*. As bad as some of Lydgate's verse unquestionably is, it strikes me as entirely unlikely that he would ever have written a poem in which the refrain failed to rhyme. If, then, it is not impossible that Lydgate originally wrote *lune* (> *luyne* > *lyne*), the argument based on the superiority of the Fairfax text collapses. (Of course, the Caxton-Huntington text is very late; here it is made clear that *lyne* stands for *line* by the rhyme *lyne: fyne*). We must also note that the first Halsham stanza corresponds not to the "opening strophe" of *A Pageant of Knowledge* but to stanza 23 of the seven-line version; that these stanzas, listed separately by Brown but printed as one poem by MacCracken, really belong together seems to be indicated by the refrain. Finally it may be pointed out that poems fashioned by combining various stanzas from Lydgate's other works have been fully treated in the previous footnote.

¹ My *Shakespeare's Young Lovers* (1937), pp. 52-58. I open up the question again, repeating a little that I said there, in order to take advantage of Mr. Evans' authority.

amorous demonstrations in public. They are unwilling to look at what they may be willing enough to read of or think about. On the stage or off it, in parks or in cars by the roadside, it brings blushes or laughter, if not a jeer. It is received, if at all, though less comfortably, like the smutty joke. And deliberately or instinctively the Elizabethan dramatists wrote to suit. What a difference between Shakespeare's love scenes and his *Venus with Adonis*, between Marlowe's *Tamburlaine with Zenocrate* and *Faustus with Helen*, on the one hand, and his *Hero with Leander*, on the other. *Venus and Adonis* and *Hero and Leander* were, we know, widely read; but put on the stage—or on our stage, either, for that matter—would have been insufferable—too much simply to jeer at.

The public sense of decorum even in our shameless and lawless days is far in advance of the private and in Elizabethan times was still more so. In my highly respectful and amicable disagreement with Mr. Granville-Barker I endeavored to show that this was not owing to the fact that women's parts were played by boys. The Elizabethan audience, accustomed (like their fathers and forefathers and all the rest of the world) to no other players for the parts, would have been in danger of laughing or jeering only at the embraces or caresses, not at the actual boy who received them. It is a curious fact that on the French stage until a generation or two ago the kissing of men and women was only suggested; and the reason that it has not been infrequent on the English stage is simply that in Elizabethan life it was a matter of common courtesy. Yet on the late Jacobean stage, as the moral tone degenerated, and on the Restoration stage, as the tone degenerated still further and the boys were replaced by women, how little evidence there is of kissing or fondling in the text! There are scarcely any caresses and little imagining of them, either, such as there are in the lyrics then or since. The voluptuousness is still by way of the joking, though now the witticisms on the lips of the high-class characters are less gross but more ingenious and insidious. The audience hear improprieties enough but witness none; and the improprieties are of course, even as in Elizabethan times, less exciting or corrupting because the effect is dissolved in merriment. Wit mitigates the indecency; laughter palliates the shame. The theatre, so far as the spectators themselves are concerned, is the place for laughter or tears, for exultation or terror, not for blushes; we must be able to look our companions or neighbors comfortably in the eye. And it

is disconcerting for them and so for us (and then for the actors in turn) to laugh when they are wincing—whether at sheer indecency in speech or at an amorous intimacy proper enough if in solitude.

The laughter, whether wholehearted or mingled with sentiment and tears, should be unanimous and by the players expected. In love-making, even when truly romantic and wholly irreproachable, merriment, either as actually on the stage or only as duly expected in the house, is generally welcome. It is for want of this today that children and some few adults are embarrassed, as well as because of the indecorum of the players. The bright accompaniment to the tender tune is provided in Shakespeare from *Love's Labour's Lost* even to *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, though there is more of wit and humour at the beginning and of naïveté and fantasy towards the end. This is not exact and faithful realism. Lovers don't joke much—to either the other's intentions then would not seem sufficiently serious—in fact they don't talk much, and they do embrace.

And yet how in Fletcher and in the Restoration dramatists, just as in Shakespeare, though differently and less charmingly, the romantic lovers keep their distance and let their tongues run on! The wooing is a wit combat or, as between Congreve's *Mirabell* and *Millamant*, a "proviso" scene. Even in some contemporary plays, like Maugham's *Circle*, it is still voluble, still witty and merry. And why so? Partly because these plays are comedies and must live up to expectations. (But *Romeo and Juliet* is not a comedy.) Partly (and much more) because the medium of all plays, unlike that of novels, is dialogue and action. Now the natural action is here, as we have seen already, avoided. And as for dialogue the Shakespearean medium is also poetry; the lovers are not poets, any more than Hamlet or Lear or Macbeth, though lately taken for such—any more than Mozart's *Don Giovanni* and *Leporello* are musicians—and though flesh-and-blood lovers may meditate the muse they do it painfully, in solitude, and mostly to painful effect. Shakespeare's, particularly his maidens, are not aware that they are poetical, nor are they so with lyrical license and abandon. For caresses by word of mouth, however poetical, are not much more acceptable on the stage than those by the touch. A lyric of Swinburne or Rossetti, even the corresponding chapter in Meredith or Hardy, cannot well be enacted. But love scenes on the stage must

be acceptable or else be forborne. By some dramatists, Molière for instance, they are. By others, like Corneille, they have been dramatized, the passion pitted against duty or honour. By still others the passion has been thrown under the shadow of death. By Shakespeare, among them; and there would, of course, have been no temptation to laugh or jeer as Cleopatra receives Antony in the monument. But Shakespeare and most of the English after him have preferred to present love in the sunlight, for its own sake, apart from tragic complications; and yet that they must in some way make dramatic too. By wit and humour Shakespeare and the English have given liveliness to their scenes, something else than "love, and love, and love, my dear" to fill up the lines, and not only negatively—by the action improbably omitted—but positively—by the badinage improbably provided—have spared our blushes. Not a case of "imitation," it is (as often in art) one of substitution, and here (as also often in art) with the happiest results. Who even today would rather look at or listen to lovers just as they move and talk and are? There is still a sense of shame in the theatre. There is still something else than realism on the stage. And "*on admet en art,*" says Lanson, "*un art qui dépasse la nature en la respectant.*"

These are not the only violations of realism in Shakespearean and Elizabethan love scenes, and some of these may seem to be in the other direction. The maidens often put on hose and doublet and in the wooing sometimes meet their lovers more than half way. They even follow them up when they have departed. All this, too, I have elsewhere endeavoured to show, was not, as it has been said to be, true to life. It is to be found not only in Elizabethan drama but in the novels before it, and not only there but also in the drama and novels and court epics of Italy and Spain, where women were still more carefully guarded and there can, in this connection, be no question of realism at all. This sort of irregularity, or impropriety, however, would obviously cause no uneasiness in the audience and bring no blush to any healthy cheek. It produces no sensation as the caresses or embraces do. Propriety is overridden by the dramatist or poet only in the interest of romance, and then the boldness, if not of pure love, becomes a measure of the love—if with grace and charm, heightens the charm. Shakespeare's maidens in love, indeed, are still more unrealistic than those of the other

Elizabethans or the continental poets. They are whole-hearted; they do not coquet. Yet they are the most delightful and at the same time the most convincing ever staged.

In all the arts there is substitution, manipulation, something of pretence or make-believe. Description, as any good writer knows, must conspire with narration. Not space but time is the literary element; not shape and colour but movement, and in good description the verbs involve it. The mountain rises, instead of standing; the plain stretches, does not lie. Painting, in turn, does all in its power to reach beyond the limits of its two dimensions and the colours of the palette. It too deals with appearances, not facts. Perspective—foreshortening—is a falsification of the bare facts in the interests of a higher reality; and snow to seem like snow and have the effect of it in a picture is not, as would be expected, painted white.

Quite as much adjustment is required for the stage, and in earlier times that was more boldly and frankly supplied. Improbable stories like those of Hamlet and Lear, Macbeth and Othello, (Edipus and Orestes, for otherwise unattainable enthralling situations—large elements of melodrama in order, as Mr. L. A. G. Strong has it, to “exhibit character at the highest pitch of intensity”—but on the subject of plot and fable we cannot here embark.²

Others than the lovers are unnaturally loquacious; Hotspur and Henry V, for instance, true Englishmen both, who protest that they are men not of words but deeds. For the leading rôles deeds are not enough. And to those of us who psychologically peer and pry, many of the other characters now seem still more self-conscious, but not to the Elizabethan or the Athenian audience. The grief-stricken, like Constance and King Lear, parade their grief or cherish it. Villains like Richard III and Iago, but unlike the criminals we know of, avow their villainy; cowards like Parolles and Falstaff, but unlike those we know of, betray or joke about their cowardice. Even the heroic are at times made aware of their heroism, the innocent of their innocence. And hypocrites like Richard and Iago, but unlike the hypocrites we know of, put on or off the white mask or cloak before our eyes. In France this treatment of hypocrisy by Molière, which (independently of course) is similar to that by Shakespeare, is recognized to be owing to the

² Cf. my *Shakespeare and Other Masters* (1940), p. 202, etc.

optique du théâtre. Though to meet other requirements or overcome prejudices of a different sort, the adjustments above mentioned are made for the perspective too.

"The transcript of his sense of fact," says Pater of the fine prose-writer, "rather than the fact, as being preferable, pleasanter, more beautiful to the writer himself!" But drama is (if it is any) a far more popular art, a matter, moreover, not of beauty merely but of power, and of the taste of the writer only in so far as this is at one with that of his audience. It is a matter also of immediate effect, and that highly charged. (Why go to the theatre if the effect there is not to be more powerful than from what is read?) And to produce it, so as to be both pleasing and moving to everybody, requires a double dose—a profounder sense of fact and (if need be) more of a change brought upon it. Shakespeare's love scenes, apparently among his closest approaches to realism, seem a case in point.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

University of Minnesota

THE DATE OF THE *CID* IN ENGLISH

In his study of Pierre Corneille in English translation and on the English stage in the 17th century, published in 1900,¹ Dr. Alfred Mulert called attention to the apparent proximity of the dates of the appearance of the first edition of the *Cid* in Paris and of that of Joseph Rutter's English translation of the same play in London. Says Dr. Mulert, speaking of this "höchst merkwürdige und leider nicht genügend aufzuhellende Thatsache":

Aus einem einfachen Vergleich der Daten ergibt sich nämlich, dass der *Cid* in Paris und eine englische Übersetzung desselben Dramas in Blankversen von Joseph Rutter in London ungefähr gleichzeitig aufgeführt und gedruckt worden sind. Zwei Exemplare dieser Übersetzung finden sich in der Bibliothek des Britischen Museums vor. Auf dem Titelblatte² ist 1637 als Erscheinungsjahr angegeben. Genauer bestimmt wird das Datum

¹ "Pierre Corneille auf der englische Bühne und in der Englischen Übersetzungs-Literatur des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts" in *Münchener Beiträge zur Romanischen und Englischen Philologie*, XVIII, 1900.

² Here a footnote quoting the title page; see below.

durch den am Ende des Werkchens beigefügten Abdruck der Druckerlaubnis. Diese lautet: "*This Tragicomedy etc. may be printed. Henry Herbert. Janu. 12. 1637.*" Auf der nächsten Seite steht: "*Imprimatur. Tho. Wykes. Jan. 26. 1637.*" Wenn wir damit vergleichen, dass es in der französischen Originalausgabe heisst: "Le privilège est daté du 21 janvier 1637," so ergibt sich die interessante und bisher wohl kaum beachtete Tatsache, dass die englische Übersetzung zur gleichen Zeit gedruckt wurde, wie das französische Original. Der Druck der letzteren war am 23. März 1637 beendet.³

Miss Dorothea Canfield, in her continuation, development, and expansion of Mulert's work four years later,⁴ followed the latter's lead on this subject:

One might not see in this [the fact that the presentation of Rutter's piece was so well received that he was commissioned to translate the 'second part' of the play⁵] anything noteworthy beyond a further proof of the

³ Mulert, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 3. Emile Picot (*Bibliographie Cornélienne*, Paris, 1876, item 902, p. 357) had made a rather equivocal statement about these dates, but apparently carried the matter no farther: "Malgré l'empressement mis par un poète anglais à traduire le Cid, l'année même de sa publication, le tempérament britannique ne paraît pas s'être accommodé aux passions toutes méridionales du héros espagnol." (Italics mine.)

⁴ *Corneille and Racine in England*, New York, 1904.

⁵ Miss Canfield (p. 4), following Mulert, turns to the account of the translation in David Erskine Baker's *Biographia Dramatica* (which, for some reason, Miss Canfield refers to throughout her book as *Biographica*): "When executed it was so well approved by the King, to whom it was shown, that at his Majesty's own desire the second part of the same piece was put into Mr. Rutter's hands with an injunction to translate it, which he immediately obeyed." She adds in a footnote: "This 'Second part of the Cid' is a translation of *La Vraie Suite du Cid*, de l'abbé Desfontaines, 1637. The English translation was published in 1640, and as late as 1699 is still cited by Langbaine [*The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, London, p. 119] as a translation from Corneille." The authorship of this sequel is no secret (cf. Picot, *op. cit.*, p. 357 and item 1392, p. 480, and Lancaster, H. C., *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part II, vol. I, Baltimore, 1932, p. 147, footnote 5), and is of no interest here except that to Miss Canfield's footnote might now be added that as late as 1926 the *Short Title Catalogue* still cites the play as belonging to Corneille (*A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, etc.* edited by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, London, 1926, p. 128). This mistake may be due to the misleading listing in the British Museum catalogue (I have consulted only the printed catalogue) where this translation of the *Second Part* is not listed separately, nor under *Desfontaines*, despite the fact that the original French edition is to be found under the latter heading. Under

interest of the English Court in French tragedy were it not for the date of the translation, which is given clearly in the British Museum copies as January 26, 1637 (O.S.). Now the date of the French privilege is given as the 21 *Janvier*, 1637 (N.S.), while the play was not actually printed until March 23, 1637 (N.S.). These dates establish the curious and significant fact that Corneille's epoch-making play was printed in English as soon as in French.

It has never been possible to determine the exact date of the first representation of *Le Cid* in Paris. It is quite as impossible to ascertain when the English translation was first acted, but it must have been presented before it was printed, as the title-page reads, 'The Cid a Tragicomedy, out of French made English: and acted before their Majesties at Court and on the Cockpitt Stage in Drury Lane, by the servants to both their Majesties.'

This early date of the English production makes a different matter of the whole affair. For it almost certainly presupposes the fact that the Earl of Dorset⁶ obtained a manuscript copy of the *Cid* while the play was still the very latest novelty and sensation in Paris. This in its turn indicates on his part an attention to theatrical affairs in Paris far keener than would be shown by the simple translation of a printed book that might be easily obtained in London from any returned traveller. With all the immense advance in means of communication between France and England, it would have been surprising if *Cyrano de Bergerac* had been translated and played in London before it was printed in Paris.⁷

As far as I know, this impression has not been publicly corrected.⁸ Although Miss Canfield took cognizance by her parentheses of the difference in date systems, she apparently did not find these

P. Corneille proper, Rutter's translation of the *Cid*, only, is listed, while under *Diaz de Bivar* (the general heading for *Cid* items), this item appears:

The Cid, a tragicomedy [by Pierre Corneille] out of French made English [with alterations, by J. Rutter. Two parts, each in five acts and in verse] London 1637-40 12°.

This second part is the Desfontaines piece, attest: Mulert, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁶ Edward Sackville (1591-1652), fourth Earl of Dorset, Lord Chamberlain to the Queen. Canfield, following Langbaine and others, states that Rutter undertook the translation at the command of Dorset, one of whose dependents he was, and to whose sons he was tutor. See the closing remarks of this article.

⁷ Canfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 5.

⁸ Of the dozen or more periodicals consulted, but one reviewed Miss Canfield's work. There, the reviewer, R. Mahrenholtz (*ZFSL*, xxviii (1905), Zweite Hälfte: Referate und Rezensionen, pp. 113, 4), accepts her conclusions: "*Le Cid* übersetzt von Joseph Rutter 1637, wahrscheinlich nach französischem Msc." The same error is found in Allardyce Nicoll's *History of Restoration Drama*, Cambridge, 1923, p. 87.

remarkable circumstances sufficiently "surprising" to consider whether the date of the Rutter translation might not be January 1637-38 instead of 1636-37.⁹ Reference to the *Stationers Register* would have indicated this to be the case. The entry as it there stands¹⁰ is as follows:

29° Januarii [1638]

Thomas Walkley. Entred for his Copy vnder the hands of Sir HENRY HERBERT. / Master WYKES and Master Aspley warden a Play called '*The Cid*' / a Tragi-comedy out of Ffrench [of PIERRE CORNEILLE] By Master RUTTER. . .

The printing of the English translation, then, followed the French printing at the distance of a year: this fact "makes a different matter of the whole affair."¹¹ The actual circumstances are not known, but it is probable that Rutter, himself a dramatic writer of sorts,¹² came into possession of a copy of the French success, and, perhaps, having set his young charges at the exercise of translating it,¹³ became himself interested in the undertaking, eventually being "commanded" by the busy lord of Knole House to bring the work to the public boards and press. In any case, the extremely abnormal course of events which Mulert and Canfield project or imply can certainly be discounted, and the story of the first English translation of the *Cid* reduced to an interesting, but far from unusual, tale.

JOHN R. KLEINSCHMIDT

Brown University

⁹ I am grateful to Professor Harcourt Brown for this suggestion.

¹⁰ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A. D.*, edited by Edward Arber, London, vol. iv, 1877, p. 380 (of entries, p. 406 of the volume).

¹¹ The establishment of this fact removes a pivotal argument of those who date the first performance of the French play 1636 instead of January, 1637.

¹² He had written and seen produced a pastoral tragi-comedy which had won the praise of Ben Jonson: *The Shepheard's Holy-Day*, London, 1635.

¹³ The *Dictionary of National Biography* (I, 31), in discussing Rutter's translation states: "Part of the translation is said to have been, the work of Rutter's pupils Richard Sackville, afterwards Earl of Dorset, and Edward (d. 1645)," and again (p. 91) *re* the same Richard (born 1622) who as Lord Buckhurst, contributed, as did his tutor himself, an elegy to the *Jonsonus Virbius* published in 1638: "Aubrey says that Samuel Butler told him that Dorset translated the '*Cid*' of Corneille into English verse (*Aubrey MSS.* vii, 9, viii, 20)."

THREE NOTES ON FRENCH AUTHORS: DESPORTES,
GUÉROULT, RONSARD1. *Desportes and Marullus*

M. Jacques Lavaud in discussing the sources of Desportes commits himself to the flat negative: 'De Marulle, Desportes n'a rien tiré.'¹ It is annoying to have one's casual remarks taken up in a literal sense, and very likely Desportes' characteristic work owes nothing to Marullus, but out in the margin, so to speak, of his poems there is an unconsidered trifle that spoils Lavaud's sentence. Among Desportes' rare epigrams the following is ultimately from the Greek Anthology (*A. P.* 9. 456):²

Quand par les rochers montagneux
Pasiphaë, de fureur contrainte,
Suivoit son amant dédaigneux,
On dit qu'elle fit cette plainte:
O Vénus, fille de la mer!
Qui causes ma flamme enragée,
Puis qu'un bœuf tu me fais aimer,
Qu'en vache ne m'as-tu changée?

The anonymous Greek verses have more point:

Πασιφάη πρὸς τὸν Ἔρωτα
Εἰ ποθέειν μ' ἐδίδας ἐν οὐρεσι ταῦρον ἀλήτην,
μνηθμὸν με δίδας, ὅτε φίλον ἄνδρα καλέσω.

Pasiphaë to Eros

If you have taught me to love a bull that strays in the mountains, teach me to low, so that I may summon my beloved.

'Teach me to low' possesses at least a certain degree of humor, whereas 'Qu'en vache ne m'as-tu changée?' is stale and pointless. Desportes cannot have had the Greek original before him. In the second place, what the Greek gives in a title, namely the occasion of the appeal, Desportes puts in his first four lines. And finally, in his epigram Pasiphaë calls upon Venus, but in the Greek upon

¹ *Un Poète de cour au temps des derniers Valois, Philippe Desportes*, Paris, 1936, p. 193.

² *Œuvres*, ed by Michiels, Paris, 1858, p. 444; the verses first came into Desportes' works in the edition of 1600 (Lavaud, *op. cit.*, p. 443).

Eros. These three departures from the original are found in Marullus' imitation of the Greek epigram:³

Cum male formosum sequeretur in avia taurum
Sic Venerem contra Gnosia questa feram est:
Si mihi bos fuerat, dea, vir te dante futurus,
Cur non insanae Praetidos ora dabas?

Perhaps Marullus, following the Greek, means *ora* = voice; but Desportes, following only Marullus, naturally understood *ora* = face or form.

2. Guillaume Guérout and Girolamo Angeriano

Some one with an interest in the minor poetry of the sixteenth century, whether it be Italian, French, or English, could profitably make a study of the influence of Angeriano's *Ἐρωτοπαίγνιον*, which was a mine of those gallant conceits in which that poetry delighted.⁴ I note at random Angeriano's influence on Luigi Groto, Michel d'Amboise, Ronsard, and the elder Giles Fletcher. Here we have to record his traces in the *Premier Livre des Emblèmes* of Guérout (Lyons, 1550).⁵ Emblem 18, *D'un peintre amoureux d'une Dame*, is from Angeriano's *De Caeliae Pictura*.⁶ Since the poem of Guérout is long and the poet not very important, I give only enough lines of both poems to prove the debt:

. . . Comment, ce dist elle,
Si ie suis cruelle
Ou tant rigoureuse,
Pourquoy gracieuse
M'as tu voulu faire?
Or sur cest affaire
Ie luy dis alors:
Iay suivy du corps
L'externe apparence,

³ *Hymni et Epigrammata*, Bologna, 1504, sig. B 12. Marullus' Latin poems were repeatedly printed in the sixteenth century; possibly for Desportes the most accessible edition would be *Poetae tres Elegantissimi, emendati et aucti, M. Marullus, H. Angerianus, J. Secundus*, ed. by L. Martellus, Paris (Duval), 1582.

⁴ The *Ἐρωτοπαίγνιον* was first published at Florence in 1512, then simultaneously at Paris and at Naples in 1520, and there were several later editions.

⁵ Ed. by De Vaux de Lancey, Rouen, 1937, p. 47.

⁶ *Ἐρωτ.*, Naples, 1520, sig. b4.

Car peindre ie doy
Ce qu'a lœil ie voy,
Et non pas la chose
Que tu tiens enclose,
Et que ton cœur pense.

. . . Si sum tam tetrica, et qui me sectantur amantes,
Expallent, mitis cur ego pingor? ait
Cui pictor: Placidum facies tua signat amorem,
Quod latet in tacito pectore nemo videt. . .

3. Ronsard and Virgil

In Ronsard's *Discours sur la poésie héroïque*, published posthumously in 1597 as a preface to his *Franciade*, the poet, pronouncing against modern Latin verse in favor of the vernacular, exclaims: 'O quantesfois ay-je souhaité que les divines testes et sacrées aux Muses de Joseph Scaliger, Daurat [etc.], voulussent employer quelques heures à si honorable labeur,

Gallica se quantis attolet gloria verbis!'

On this Latin verse Pierre de Nolhac's comment is: 'Ce vers pourrait être, par jeu, de Ronsard lui-même.'⁷ If de Nolhac could momentarily forget Virgil, there is a chance that subsequent commentators may also miss the point. Ronsard, of course, parodies the words of Anna to Dido (*Aen.* 4. 49): If Dido can but get Aeneas for her husband, what a kingdom she will have, and

Teucrum comitantibus armis

Punica se quantis attolet gloria rebus.

The line is indeed 'par jeu de Ronsard lui-même,' but the play is not that which de Nolhac probably had in mind.

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

ROUSSEAU AND FAUST

Romantic yearning for the infinite is strongly marked in both Rousseau and Goethe. The lines of Henry Van Dyke on Shelley:

Knight errant of the never ending quest
And minstrel of the unfulfilled desire

⁷ *Ronsard et l'humanisme*, Paris, 1921, p. 245, n. 6.

frequently come to mind in reading Rousseau or *Faust*. Hence the comparison of a passage in *La Cinquième Rêverie* with the wager between Faust and Mephistopheles may not be without interest. It will be remembered that in previous versions of the legend the compact was for a limited period—usually twenty-four years—and that Goethe was the first to make the term a moment of perfect satisfaction to Faust. I have not been able to learn the exact date at which the wager was introduced by Goethe into the poem. In the fragment, published in 1790, the scene begins some seventy lines further on:

Und was der ganzen Menschheit zugeteilt ist,
Will ich in meinem, innern Selbst geniessen . . .

Apparently, in 1790, Goethe had not determined on the exact form the wager was to take. The first part of this scene would seem to have been composed after 1800. The first part of *Faust*, complete, was published in 1808. The *Rêveries* were written between 1776 and 1778, and first published in 1782. In the fifth we find this passage:

Tout est dans un flux continuel sur la terre. Rien n'y garde une forme constante et arrêtée, et nos affections qui s'attachent aux choses extérieures passent et changent nécessairement comme elles. Toujours en avant ou en arrière de nous, elles rappellent le passé, qui n'est plus, ou préviennent l'avenir, qui souvent ne doit point être; il n'y a rien là de solide à quoi le cœur se puisse attacher. Aussi n'a-t-on guère ici-bas que du plaisir qui passe; pour le bonheur qui dure, je doute qu'il y soit connu. A peine est-il, dans nos plus vives jouissances, un instant où le cœur puisse véritablement nous dire: *Je voudrais que cet instant durât toujours*. Et comment peut-on appeler bonheur un état fugitif qui nous laisse le cœur inquiet et vide, qui nous fait regretter quelque chose avant, ou désirer encore quelque chose après?

Faust's compact with Mephistopheles runs as follows:

Faust. Werd' ich beruhigt je mich auf ein Faulbett legen,
So sei es gleich um mich getan!
Kannst du mich schmeichelnd je belügen,
Dass ich mir selbst gefallen mag,
Kannst du mich mit Genuss betrügen;
Das sei für mich der letzte Tag!
Die Wette biet'ich!

Mephistopheles. Topp!

Faust. Und Schlag auf Schlag!
Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen:

Verweile doch! du bist so schön!
Dann magst du mich in Fesseln schlagen . . .

I would not venture to claim a direct source in Rousseau's lines, but the mood expressed is strikingly similar to that of Faust in certain of his early speeches and in his conversations with Mephistopheles.¹ Here then is a bit of concrete evidence that Rousseau's appeal to Goethe continued into his maturity.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

Reed College

THREE SOURCES OF VIGNY'S JOURNAL

The background of Vigny's reading from 1833 to 1835 included three authors whose influence on the French poet may need more emphasis.

Under the date June 20, 1833, we read in the *Journal d'un poète*: "Éros.—L'esclave de Néron, Éros, se tue devant lui pour l'encourager à mourir."¹ Vigny's memory failed him at this point. Plutarch, whom he had been reading, relates the incident of Éros, the slave of Antony.² There is no record of such an act in connection with Nero.

The horizon of Vigny's reading in 1834 is seen to have been further extended by his notes on Joseph de Maistre. Once more what appears as an original observation in the *Journal* is taken directly from a book Vigny was absorbing. "La philosophie antique renfermait toute la sagesse humaine dans cette maxime: Souffre et abstiens-toi. 'Ανέχου καὶ ἀπέχου, sentant que nos plus

¹ Possibly the passage from Rousseau may throw some light on the much discussed lines 1675 ff: "Was willst du armer Teufel geben?" Faust will have none of the known satisfactions which man or devil can offer; his is a never ending quest; in a moment of intense agony of mind he had contemplated suicide; he is certain now that Mephisto cannot win the wager, but as he had refrained from taking his own life—

"Man sehnt sich nach des Lebens Bächen,
Ach! nach des Lebens Quelle hin,"

he resolves to continue his quest, although without any illusion of hope.

¹ Conard edition, edited by Baldensperger, 1935, I, 266.

² *Lives*, v, 123. Burt & Co.

fortes inclinations sont vicieuses et tendent à la destruction de la Société. La loi chrétienne fait de cette victoire continuelle sur nous un précepte éternel. Donc l'individu est reconnu partout comme ennemi naturel de la Société." . . .³

Joseph de Maistre had written: "La philosophie seule avait deviné depuis longtemps que toute la sagesse de l'homme était renfermée en deux mots: Sustine et Abstine (souffre et abstiens-toi. C'est le fameux *'Αρέχου καὶ ἀπέχου* des Stoïciens) . . . elle a fort bien compris que les plus fortes inclinations de l'homme étant vicieuses au point qu'elles tendent évidemment à la destruction de la société, il n'avait pas de plus grand ennemi que lui-même. . . . Mais la loi chrétienne . . . fait de l'abstinence en général, ou de la victoire habituelle remportée sur nos désirs, un précepte capital qui doit régler toute la vie de l'homme." . . .⁴

The poet's reflections on "Fatalité et Providence"⁵ are inspired likewise by Joseph de Maistre.⁶ So are those on "le bourreau,"⁷ "Gravité,"⁸ and "le mal."⁹

The author of *Stello* and *Servitude* expressed satisfaction on reading in 1835 that Goethe "fut ennuyé des questions de tout le monde sur la vérité de *Werther*. On ne cessait de s'informer à lui de ce qu'il renfermait de vrai."¹⁰ He had been reading *Dichtung und Wahrheit* in which Goethe says, "denn anstatt dass mir jemand über mein Büchlein, wie es lag, etwas Verbindliches gesagt hätte, so wollten sie sämtlich ein für allemal wissen, was denn eigentlich an der Sache wahr sei?"¹¹

C. WESLEY BIRD

Fresno State College,
Fresno, California

³ *Op. cit.*, I, 290. Cf. the same, lacking the Greek, I, 286.

⁴ *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*, Premier Entretien.

⁵ *Journal*, 1834, I, 295.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, Premier Entretien.

⁷ *Journal*, 1834, I, 296. Cf. Premier Entretien.

⁸ *Journal*, 1834, I, 301. Cf. J. de Maistre, Garnier ed., II, 63.

⁹ *Journal*, 1834, I, 306. Cf. Premier Entretien, I, 21.

¹⁰ *Journal*, 1835, I, 329. The italics are Vigny's.

¹¹ *Goethes Werke in sechs Bänden*, Leipsig, Vol. 5, pt. III, bk. 13, p. 426.

A NOTE ON SHELLEY AND MILTON

An extended investigation of the sources of Shelley's poetry has convinced the present writer that Shelley's debt to Milton is greater than Professor Havens's book on the influence of Milton would lead readers to believe. The following selected list of verbal parallels is not intended to be exhaustive but may be of assistance to any one proposing to study the extent of Milton's influence on Shelley.

1. Every sight
And sound from the vast earth and ambient air. (*Alastor*, 68-9)
This which yeelds or fills
All space, the ambient Aire wide interfus'd
Imbracing round this florid Earth. (*P. L.*, VII, 88-90)
The phrase occurs also in Southey's *Curse of Kehama* (IX, 4) and in Young's *Night Thoughts* (VIII, i, 186). Southey and Milton are more likely sources than Young.
2. Divine philosophy. (*Alastor*, 71)
Divine philosophy. (*Comus*, 475)
Shelley quotes the lines from *Comus* which contain this phrase in his review of Godwin's *Mandeville* which appeared in Hunt's *Examiner*, Dec. 28, 1817. (*Prose*, Julian edition, VI, 221.)
3. He eagerly pursues
Beyond the realms of dream that fleeting shade;
He overleaps the bounds. . . . (*Alastor*, 205-7)
But true love never yet
Was thus constrained; it overleaps all fence. (*Epips.*, 397-8)
Due entrance he disdained, and in contempt
At one slight bound high overleap'd all bound. (*P. L.*, IV, 180-81)
4. Dark, gleaming, and of most translucent wave. (*Alastor*, 458)
Under the glassy, cool, translucent wave. (*Comus*, 860)
5. They framed the imperial tent of their great Queen
Of woven exhalations, underlaid
With lambent lightning-fire, as may be seen
A dome of thin and open ivory inlaid
With crimson silk; cressets from the serene
Hung there. . . . (*Witch of Atlas*, LIII, 1-6)
Anon out of the earth a fabric huge
Rose like an exhalation. . . .
. . . and Doric pillars overlaid
With golden architrave . . .
The roof was fretted gold . . .
. . . from the arched roof

Pendant by subtle magic, many a row
 Of starry lamps and blazing cressets fed
 With naphtha and asphaltus yielded light
 As from a sky. . . . (P. L., I, 710-30)

6. The pinnacle, oared by those enchanted wings. (Witch, XLV, 7)
 Oaring with rosy feet its silver boat. (*Revolt of Islam*, VII, XXVII, 2)
 The Swan with Arched neck
 Between her white wings mantling proudly, Rowes
 Her state with Oarie feet. (P. L., VII, 438-40)

But one may also notice that James Thomson, another of the earlier poets with whom Shelley was familiar, should perhaps have a claim here:

Swan . . . with oary feet
 Bears forward fierce. (Spring, 780-81)
 The boat light-skimming stretched its oary wings. (Autumn, 129)

7. By many a star-surrounded pyramid
 Of icy crag cleaving the purple sky. (Witch, XXXVIII, 6-7)
 Under a star-ypointing Pyramid. (On Shakespear, 4)

8. All gaunt
 And sanguine beasts her gentle looks made tame . . .
 And every beast of beating heart grew bold,
 Such gentleness and power even to behold,
 The brinded lioness led forth her young
 That she might teach them how they should forego
 Their inborn thirst of death, the pard unstrung
 His sinews at her feet. (Witch VI, 4-8; VII, 1-4)

Hence had the huntress Dian her dred bow
 Fair silver-shafted Queen for ever chaste,
 Wherwith she tam'd the brinded lioness
 And spotted mountain pard. (Comus, 440-43)
 Both poets are talking of the power of gentleness and chastity over wild beasts.

9. And first the spotted camelopard came,
 And then the wise and fearless elephant;
 Then the sly serpent, in the golden flame
 Of his own volumes intervolved. (Witch, VI, 1-4)

Bears, tigers, ounces, pards
 Gambold before them, th'unwieldy elephant
 To make them mirth us'd all his might, and wreathd
 His lithe proboscis; close the serpent sly
 Insinuating, wove with Gordian twine
 His breaded train. (P. L., IV, 344-49)

10. Plotting dark spells and devilish enginery. (*Maria Gisborne*, 107)
 Training his devilish Enginrie. (P. L., VI, 553)

11. Noticed by Professor Havens has been the influence of Milton upon *Maria Gisborne* (198-99):

greater none than he,
Though fallen—and fallen on evil times . . .

though fall'n on evil days,
On evil days though fall'n and evil tongues. (P. L., VII, 25-6)

An earlier echo of the same line appears in *Rosalind and Helen* (473-74),

Poverty
Among the fallen on evil days . . .

12. Morning sought
Her eastern watch-tower. (Adonais, XIV, 3-4)

And singing startle the dull night
From his watch-towre in the skies. . . . (L'Allegro, 42-43)

13. The sun comes forth and many reptiles spawn. (Adonais, XXIX, 1)
Reptile with spawn abundant. (P. L., VII, 388)

14. The Fiend, whose name was Legion, Death, Decay,
Earthquake and Blight and Want and Madness pale
Winged and wan diseases, an array
Numerous as leaves that strew the autumnal gale.
(Revolt Islam, I, xxix, 1-4)

Till on the beach
Of that inflamed sea he stood, and call'd
His legions, angel forms, who lay entranc'd
Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks
In Vallombrosa. . . . (P. L., I, 299-303)

15. My vision then grew clear and I could see
Into the mysteries of the universe.
Dizzy as with delight I floated down;
Winnowing the lightsome air with languid plumes.
(Prometheus Unbound, III, iv, 104-7)

From hence no cloud, or, to obstruct his sight,
Starr interpos'd, however small he sees . . .
Earth and the Gard'n of God . . .
Down thither prone in flight
He speeds, and through the vast Ethereal Skie
Sailes between worlds and worlds, with steddie wing
Now on the polar windes, then with quick Fann
Winnows the buxom Air. . . . (P. L., v, 257-70)

16. Under the gray beak of some promontory. (Epips., 198)
Up to some beaked cape of cloud sublime. (Witch of Atlas, LV, 3)
That blows from off each beaked promontory. (Lycidas, 94)

17. Vegetable fire. (Prometheus Unbound, III, iv, 110)
Vegetable silver. (Prometheus Unbound, IV, 283)
Vegetable gold. (Paradise Lost, IV, 220)

18. Sinks headlong through the aerial golden light. (*Ode Liberty*, 275)
Hurl'd headlong flaming from th'etereal sky. (P. L., I, 45)
19. In a favorite figure of Shelley's, Ianthe's tresses shade her bosom
(*Queen Mab*, I, 43-44),
Curling like tendrils of the parasite
Around a marble column . . .
It is likely that Shelley had Milton's Eve in his mind's eye, for her
tresses, golden like Ianthe's (P. L., IV, 305-7)
in wanton ringlets wav'd
As the vine curls her tendrils.
20. Milton's Eve puts in another appearance in *The Sensitive Plant*, where
the lady of the garden is called "an Eve in this Eden" (II, 2)
and ministers to the flowers much as does Milton's heroine:
She lifted their heads with her tender hands,
And sustained them with rods and osier-bands. (II, 37-38)
Oft stooping to support
Each Flour of slender stalk, whose head though gay,
Carnation, Purple, Azure, or aspect with Gold,
Hung drooping unsustained, them she upstaies
Gently with Mirtle band. (P. L., IX, 427-31)

An echo from Milton in *The Revolt of Islam* (Canto I) requires a more extended explanation. Reviewing Shelley's poems in the *Examiner*, Leigh Hunt commented as follows on the passage in question: "A magic and obscure circumstance then takes place, the result of which is: that the woman and the serpent are seen no more, but that a cloud opens asunder and a bright and beautiful shape, which seems compounded of both, is beheld sitting on a throne—a circumstance apparently imitated from Milton."¹ Hunt does not trouble to be more specific but seems to have had in mind Satan's return to Pandemonium in Book x. Like the Serpent of Good in Shelley, Satan passes unseen through the assembled throng in his Plutonian Hall and ascends his throne.

Down a while
He sate and round about him saw unseen:
At last as from a cloud his fulgent head
And shape Starr-bright appeer'd, or brighter, clad
With what permissive glory since his fall
Was left him. . . . (Paradise Lost, x, 47-52)

¹ *Examiner*, Feb. 1, 22, and March 1, 1818. Reprinted by Newman I. White, *The Unextinguished Hearth*. See p. 118.

Shelley's description compares rather favorably (*Revolt of Islam*, I, lvii).

The cloud which rested on that cone of flame
Was cloven; beneath the planet sate a Form,
Fairer than tongue can speak or thought may frame,
The radiance of whose limbs rose-like and warm
Flowed forth, and did with softest light inform
The shadowy dome, the sculptures and the state
Of those assembled shapes—with clinging charm
Sinking upon their hearts and mine. He sate
Majestic yet most mild, calm yet compassionate.

Shelley of course is presenting a good, Milton an evil character. Yet the scenes are not otherwise dissimilar. A shadowy hall is crowded with shapes; over the high throne in the middle hovers an apparently empty cloud, in the midst of which the assemblage presently becomes aware of a radiant and majestic male form who occupies the throne.

CARLOS BAKER

Princeton University

REFERENCES TO THE DRAMA IN THE MILD MAY DIARY

There are a number of references to the theatre in the diary and accounts book of Sir Humphrey Mildmay for the years 1633-1652.¹ Mildmay, a country gentleman whose principal estate was at Danbury in Essex, spent much of his time in London and was a frequent playgoer in the years before the Civil Wars. The diary entries are brief and contain very little comment upon the performances, beyond an occasional observation such as "a base play," or "a pretty comedy." All too frequently the name of the play is omitted. The diarist's "expenses" at a play (never itemized) were usually about one shilling and sixpence, but ranged from sixpence to as much as seven shillings and sixpence when his wife was with him. The theatres visited include the Cockpit, the Globe, the Red Bull, and especially the Blackfriars.

Only one of Shakespeare's plays is mentioned, and that is *Othello*

¹ Harleian MSS. No. 454, British Museum. The writer is preparing for publication an annotated edition of the manuscript from a filmed copy in the possession of the Yale University library.

("The Moor of Venice") which Mildmay saw at the Blackfriars, May 6, 1635. The other plays which can be identified are, with the dates attended, as follows: Ralph Mabbe's *The Spanish Bawd*, May 18, 1632; Fletcher and Massinger's *Rollo*, at the Globe, May 23, 1633;² Davenant's *The Wits*, at the Blackfriars, January 22, 1633-4;³ Fletcher's *The Pastoral*, February 7, 1633-4;⁴ *Lasander and Calista*⁵ ("being a poem"), May 21, 1634; Davenant's *Love and Honor*, December 12, 1634;⁶ Fletcher's *The Elder Brother*, at the Blackfriars, April 25, 1635; Shirley's *The Lady of Pleasure* (a "rare play"), December 8, 1635;⁷ and Fletcher's *The Mad Lover*,⁸ May 21, 1639. Another dramatic allusion may be contained in the entry for Sunday, April 3, 1634: "After supper to the Spaniards Discipline." No play by this title has been discovered, but it is conceivable that the reference is to Dekker's tragedy *The Spanish Soldier* (or *The Noble Spanish Soldier*) which was entered on the books of the Stationers' Company in 1631 and 1633 and was printed in 1634.⁹ "Cataline" (presumably Ben Jonson's *Catiline's Conspiracy*) Mildmay saw acted at court, Sunday, November 9, 1634.

² It was performed at court by the King's Men in January, 1637. Fleay, *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, p. 349.

³ The play was licensed only three days before (January 19). J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 35.

⁴ It was performed at the Cockpit in court by the King's Players on April 8 following. Fleay, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

⁵ According to Fleay this play, by Fletcher and Massinger, was based upon Daudiguier's *Lysandre et Caliste*, was licensed as *Cleander*, and was also called *The Lovers' Progress*. Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 219-20. *Cleander* was licensed by Herbert, May 7, 1634, and is reported to have been performed before the Queen at Blackfriars on May 13, 1634. Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 35, 65. The diary entry indicates that the title of the French original was holding its own.

⁶ Licensed on November 20 preceding. Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

⁷ Licensed on October 15 preceding. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁸ Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 207. It is listed among plays acted by the King's Company, 1660-1662. Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 117. Possibly it is the same as *The Bridegroom and the Madman*, ascribed to Fletcher or Beaumont and Fletcher, and included in the King's Men's repertory of 1641. G. M. Sibley, *The Lost Plays and Masques, 1500-1642*, p. 18.

⁹ Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 128. J. O. Halliwell-Phillips, *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, pp. 234-5. Fleay identified this play with Dekker's *The Spanish Fig*. Cf. also Sibley, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

The masque *The Triumph of Peace* by Shirley and Inigo Jones was performed twice in the month of February, 1633-4. The testimony of the diary helps to fix the exact dates of these performances, concerning which conflicting statements have persisted. Bulstrode Whitelock gives the date of the first exhibition, which took place at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, as Candlemas night, that is February 2.¹⁰ A letter of February 14 from Robert Reade to Thomas Windebank names the 4th.¹¹ Mildmay, however, records that he saw the masque on the night of February 3, and this date is affirmed by Fleay,¹² who apparently used the diary as an unacknowledged source. The masque was repeated, at the king's request, in Merchant Taylors' Hall, on February 13, according to the diary, and this date is substantiated by Robert Reade's letter cited above. Fleay places the date of the second performance on Tuesday, February 11,¹³ probably because he misread the diary entry for February 13 as February 11. He could easily have made this mistake because there are no entries for the 11th and 12th.

PHILIP L. RALPH

Rutgers University

MILTON'S ENGLISH AGAIN

Despite the lack of a careful study of Milton's English, many scholars and critics have spoken in definite terms of its large borrowed element. Typical is the view expressed by Leonard Welstead in his *Dissertation Concerning the Perfection of the English Language* (1724). He speaks of "an uncouth unnatural jargon like the phrase and style of Milton, which is a second Babel, or confusion of languages."¹

¹⁰ Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs*, I, 56-60.

¹¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1633-4*, p. 464.

¹² *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, p. 318.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

¹ *Works* (London, 1787), p. 123. For other similar statements, see Addison, *Spectator* number 297 (Feb. 9, 1712); Samuel Johnson, *Lives of The Poets*, G. B. Hill edition (Oxford, 1905), I, 189-191; Max Schlicht, *The Influence of Latin and Greek on Milton's Vocabulary*, Rostock University diss. (1873), p. 4; R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*

The confusion resulting when generalizations about an author's use of native and borrowed vocabulary are not based upon a careful, thorough investigation is nowhere more clearly illustrated than by the generalizations about Chaucer's diction. Until the publication of Joseph Mersand's etymological study² of every word Chaucer used, we had no exact statement of the native and borrowed element in Chaucer's vocabulary, though many Chaucerians had expressed views on the subject. That a similar confusion may exist in the traditional view of Milton's vocabulary, and that the greater part of Milton's vocabulary may be native in origin, has been suggested by Professor G. C. Taylor in his study of the words in "Lycidas."³ It is my purpose here further to refute the prevailing notion of the alien quality of Milton's words by submitting the results obtained from a vocabulary study of "L'Allegro," and to comment briefly upon the method of pursuing such a study.

I.

"L'Allegro" is a poem which contains 495 different words;⁴ 338 of the words are of native origin, 157 of foreign. The vocabulary of the poem is therefore 68 per cent native. A more significant fact revealed by this study is that all but 12 of the 495 words used appear in Middle English. If we consider as native any word in use before 1500, only approximately 21½ percent of the total vocabulary of "L'Allegro" is borrowed. This result is quite different from the figures cited by Marsh,⁵ Masson,⁶ and Hanford.⁷ When we consider it with the result obtained by Professor Taylor,⁸ we see the possibility that the traditional view of Milton's vocabulary is erroneous.

(Cambridge, 1922), p. 66; J. H. Hanford, *Milton Handbook* (New York, 1939), p. 294.

² *Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary* (Brooklyn, New York: The Comet Press, 1937).

³ *Notes and Queries*, Jan. 27, 1940, pp. 56-7.

⁴ This figure does not include proper names (18), prepositions (16), conjunctions (7), and articles (2).

⁵ G. P. March, *Lectures on the English Language*, fourth edition (New York, 1862), p. 124. Masson and Hanford simply reproduce Marsh's figures.

⁶ David Masson, *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (New York, 1893), III, 151-7.

⁷ *Supra*, n. 1.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

The words not found in Middle English are:

admit	invite
antique	perhaps
cynosure	quips
ebon	regained
frolic	rouse
horrid	secure

II.

Marsh pointed out that there are two fundamentally different methods of conducting a study to determine the elements of an author's vocabulary: (1) by examining the words "at rest," that is, by counting each different word only once and by disregarding the number of times any given word is used; and (2) by examining the words "in action," that is, by taking into account the number of times every word is used.⁹ The composition of the English language makes it necessary to combine these two methods in arriving at a true evaluation of any literary vocabulary, since, although the borrowed elements in English form approximately two-thirds of the whole vocabulary, the native element is the framework. It is only natural, therefore, that when the words, as found in a dictionary or concordance, are examined with no regard to the relative frequency of use, the borrowed percentage becomes much larger than when frequency is considered. As Trench said in 1855:

The Anglo-Saxon is not so much, as I have just called it, one element of the English language, as the foundation of it, the basis. All its joints, its whole articulation, its sinews and its ligaments, the great body of articles, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, numerals, auxiliary verbs, all smaller words which serve to knit together and bind the larger into sentences, these, not to speak of the grammatical structure of the language, are exclusively Saxon. The Latin may contribute its tale of bricks, yea, of goodly and polished hewn stones to the spiritual building, but the mortar, with all that holds and binds these together, and constitutes them into a house, is Saxon throughout.¹⁰

Behind this patriotic assertion lies a partial explanation for the over-emphasis on the borrowed element, chiefly Latin, of Milton's

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 118 ff. See also R. C. Trench, *English Past and Present* (New York, 1855), p. 27.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

diction; for the investigations have been made of his language "at rest" with no consideration of the more important function of the native words in his language "in action."

Marsh's theory of vocabulary study was excellent; he emphasized the importance of both approaches and the great danger of drawing conclusions from an investigation of portions of a given author's writings. His method of presenting his findings, however, has resulted in a misinterpretation by later scholars.¹¹ We have seen that there is a wide divergence between the prevailing opinion of the elements of Milton's vocabulary and the results obtained by careful investigation, and it is evident that a thorough, scientific study of his language is needed to provide us with definite facts.

Applied to "L'Allegro," Marsh's method yields significant results. Here Milton's language "at rest," as we have seen, is 68 per cent native. That "in action," however, is 75 per cent native.¹² If we include proper names, prepositions, conjunctions, and articles, moreover, the vocabulary "in action" is 81 per cent native.¹³

R. M. LUMIANSKY

University of North Carolina

HAUSE AND SLAVES IN KING LEAR

1. In II, iv, 75-77,¹ the mocking fool, who has just given Kent his counsel of time-serving, turns his advice into a jibe. "When a

¹¹ Marsh found the native element of Milton's poetic vocabulary "at rest" to be 33 per cent, and that of the "L'Allegro" vocabulary "in action" 90 per cent, but gave no figure for the total vocabulary "in action" or the "L'Allegro" vocabulary "at rest." It is interesting to note that his figures on Chaucer's diction were similarly misunderstood by later Chaucerians. (See Mersand, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-7).

¹² The vocabulary "in action" includes 647 words; 486 native, 161 borrowed. Proper names (18), prepositions (114), conjunctions (71), and articles (70) are excluded.

¹³ Here the vocabulary "in action" includes 920 words; 741 native, 179 borrowed. Since March presumably included proper names, prepositions, conjunctions, and articles, his 90 per cent native element (see above, n. 11) is to be compared with the 81 per cent found here.

¹ The lineation of the Arden Edition is used.

wise man gives thee better counsel," he says, "give me mine again: I would hause none but knaves follow it, since a fool gives it."

Hause is the reading of the Folio, and editors have united to reject it as a mere mistake for *haue*. Despite this consensus of opinion, *hause* seems almost certainly correct. It is derived from OE. *halsian*, by the development of a diphthong before *l* plus a consonant, and by the subsequent loss of *l*, and both *NED.* and Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* offer evidence which indicates that the form is genuine.² The meaning, of course, is "to adjure" or "to beseech."

The only possible objection to *hause* must be based on a general theory of the relations between the Quartos and the Folio, and at present there is a great deal that could be said to prove the superiority not of the Quartos, only the first of which has any real value, but of the Folio. Even if the wildly improbable should occur and the first Quarto should be accepted as the primary source, there would still remain the fact that *hause* is far the more difficult reading. Housman's acid warning not to neglect inferior sources must be remembered; and often an elementary knowledge of linguistic history and a proper reverence for the more difficult variants will be more valuable than complicated theories.

2. In iv, i, 68-70, Gloucester calls upon the gods:

Let the superfluous and lust-dieted man,
That slaves your ordinance, that will not see
Because he doth not feel, feel your power quickly. . . .

Slaves has given some difficulty. It is the Folio reading, and has usually been preferred to Quarto *stands*, though some editors have accepted *stands* in some such sense as "opposes," "withstands." The meaning of *slaves*, however, is not quite clear. Most often it has been interpreted to mean "enslaves," "treats as a slave"; but Warburton's tentative emendation, *braves*, long ago suggested that this interpretation is not wholly satisfactory. An entirely different solution seems easier and more probable, if *slaves* be related to OE. *slāfan*, NE. *slave*, which *NED.* glosses "to cleave, split, rend, tear apart."³ Shakespeare pronounced the word with a long *e*,⁴ for

² Wyld, *Short History of English*, §§ 218, 284 (3); see *NED.* s. v. Halse.

³ *NED.*'s *slave*, v. 1, might also be compared.

⁴ Wyld, § 232.

which sound an occasional spelling was *a*,⁵ and a definite parallel is found in *NED.*, which lists *slave*, v. 2, as a rare and obsolete verb, meaning "to tear away or split," and quotes two instances dated 1523.

JAMES SLEDD

University of Texas

ON SIX OLD-ICELANDIC WORDS

In a recent reading of the description of twelfth-century Rome in the itinerary, or better pilgrim-diary of Nikólás, abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Munkaþverá (Eyjafjarðar sýsla), Iceland,¹ I have noticed five words used in senses not adequately analysed in the dictionaries and a sixth word which I do not understand.

I. *borg* f. "suburb"

The passage in Kálund (18, 15-17) runs: *Vestr frá borginni er Páls Kirkia; þar er munclífi ok borg um útan, er gengr or Róma* "To the west of the city (of Rome) is the church of S. Paolo (fuori), where there is a monastery, and out around a *suburb*, which extends out from Rome." Now, the *borg* out around the basilica of S. Lorenzo and adjacent monastery is (was) specifically the *suburb* of Iohannapolis,² and there can be no reasonable doubt

⁵ Wyld, § 232. 1 (c).

¹ Ed. E. C. Werlauff, *Symbolae ad Geographiam Medii Ævi ex Monumentis islandicis* (Copenhagen, 1821), pp. 22-4, Latin translation parallel to the Icelandic text. This edition is cited in the dictionaries as "Symb." More recently we have the edition of Kristian Kálund in *Alfræði íslensk* 1 (Copenhagen, 1908), 17-19, with his Danish translation of the same in *Aarbøger f. nordisk Oplyndighed og Historie*, 3d ser., III (Copenhagen, 1913), 57-59; for the identification of places and monuments Kálund is much indebted to Werlauff and to Paul Riant, *Expéditions et Pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des Croisades* (Paris, 1865), pp. 81-89. In the following notes I cite from Kálund's edition.

For further details about Nikólás and his pilgrim-diary see Magoun, "The Rome of Two Northern Pilgrims: Archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury and Abbot Nikólás of Munkaþverá," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIII, October 1940.

² On the great monastery and the *borgo* or Christian settlement, guarded against Saracen raids by a redoubt built by Pope John VIII in 880 and hence known as Iohannapolis (Giovannipolis), see Mariano Armellini, *Le*

that Nikólás is here using *borg* in just this sense (vs. *borg* used for the "city" of Rome in the same sentence quoted above); cp. Ital. *borgo*, and *Borgo* as a district or "region" of Rome. The modern language would, I take it, prefer *útborg*, which in earlier times meant "outer-fortifications" of the like. Werlauff's *cum arce* (p. 23), i. e. "with a citadel" is probably not right here, nor is Kålund's *borg* (*Aarbøger* 58); for a Latin translation, *burgum*, or perhaps *suburbium*, would be the word; for Danish, certainly *Forstad*.

II. *dagr* (enn áttandi dagr Jóla), "octave" (of Christmas)

The passage in Kålund (17, 27—18, 1) runs as follows: *þar skal páfi messo syngia enn viii. dag Jóla* "There (in S. Lorenzo fuori) the pope must sing mass on the octave of Christmas (December 31st)." This is rightly translated into Latin (Werlauff 22: *octavo Natalitiorum die*)³ and into Danish (*Aarbøger* 57: *ottende dag i jul*); in all dictionaries, however, especially English—Icelandic, the definition "octave" (of a Christian feast) should be entered (e. g. in Cleasby—Vigfússon under "*dagr*" 3 γ) since this is not only the orthodox but also the only possible modern English rendering of the ecclesiastical Latin *octava* (*dies*) or *in octavis* in this same sense (see *NED.*, under "octave" sb., 1).

III. *ker* n. (*gullker*), "(gold) reliquary"

The passage in Kålund (17, 23-4) runs as follows: *ok margir aðrir helgir dómar varðir í eino gullkeri miclo* "and many other relics (are) preserved in a large gold reliquary." The renderings "golden vessel" of Cleasby-Vigfússon and "guldkar" of Egilsson—Jónsson will not do; for *ker* is here certainly used in the specifically ecclesiastical sense of reliquary (med. Lat. *reliquarium*, not Werlauff 22: *magno vase aureo*, nor *Aarbøger* 57: *glaskar!*). The modern language would, I suppose, render this by *gullskrin* n.

IV. *nál* f. "obelisk"

The passage in Kålund (19, 4) runs: *Péturs nál er hiá úti fyrir vestan* "St Peter's Obelisk is nearby outside to the west (of the *Chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX* (2d ed., Rome, 1891), pp. 930-31 and Christian Hülsen, *Le Chiese di Roma nel Medio Evo* (Florence, 1927), p. 325, § 30.

³ *Dies* in the sense of a "fixed" or "set day" is preferably feminine.

east-end of old St Peter's)." The use of a word for "needle" (here *nál*) for "obelisk" is familiar in many languages and, applied to this very monument, is for example found in Trevisa's translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*: "*seynte Peters nedle*" (*NED.*, under "needle" sb., II. 6. a, 1387). Both the Icelandic and Middle-English renderings reflect pilgrim translations of *Aguglia di s. Pietro*, where *aguglia*, as in modern Italian, means "needle," also "obelisk" (along side of Ital. *obelisco*). In Nikolás's day this obelisk, brought by Caligula from Heliopolis in Lower Egypt and now located in the Piazza di s. Pietro, was on the south side of the old basilica, just west of the round side-chapel of St. Andrew, that is, pretty well up towards the west-end and hence "west" (*fyrir vestan*) of the main entrances at the east-end. On this old location see Hans Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1927), p. 175, 311 and Pl. 13 f, and for the obelisk itself the *Enciclopedia italiana*, Vol. xxv, Pl. 15 facing p. 100. The modern language must, I suppose, use (*egypzk*) *steinsúla*.

V. *umskurðr* m. "prepuce"

The passage in Kålund (17, 22) runs: *þar er umskurðr Christi* "there (in St John Lateran) is Christ's prepuce," the latter object being included in a list of relics. Werlauff 22: *hic præputium Christi* has it right, in other words he understood *circumcisio* in the familiar med. Lat. concrete sense of "foreskin." *Aarbøger* 57: *dær er Christi omskæring* is, except to the cognoscenti, nonsense. The modern language would doubtless here prefer *yfirhúð*, Danish *Forhud*.

VI. *blaungaz*?

The passage in Kålund (16, 3) runs: *ok saurgaz hon (Tár á) allðri ne blaungaz* "and it (the Taro) is never polluted and is not roiled(?)." Werlauff 19 renders *blaungaz* by *miscetur*, Kålund in *Aarbøger* 57 by *blandes*. This is all very likely right, but what is the verb *blaunga*? To suggest that we have here a palaeographic distortion of *blandaz* would, of course, be the sheerest guesswork. *Saurga* is, of course, a straightforward derivative from *saurigr* adj. "filthy" "polluted."

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

GOTHIC *þis*: *þiz-ei*, *-uh*; *hvis*: *hviz-uh*; *anþaris*: *anþariz-uh*, etc.

Since the *-z* in *þiz-ei* does not correspond to North and West Gic. *-s* (ON *þes(s)*, OE *þæs*, OS *þes*, OHG *des*), Goth. *þiz-* must be explained either as phonetically correct (< **þezo*) or as due to the leveling of *-s-* (*þis* < **þeso*) in favor of the phonetically correct medial *z* in the other forms of the paradigm.

Van Helten¹ attempts to explain this discrepancy between Goth. *-z-* and North-West Gic. *-s* as due to a difference of accentuation in PGic.; *-iz* < **-esó* and *-es* < **-éssó* with *s* from the dat. sing. ending **-esmo*. The *-ss* in ON *þess* he considers as a survival of **-esso*. The main objection to van Helten's hypothesis is that it separates the Gothic from the North-West Gic. in regard to *s*:*z* which elsewhere is parallel in the pronominal forms. Furthermore, ON *þess* most likely represents a later analogical form,² since it is not in keeping with the corresponding forms with *-s* in West Gic.

Prokosch considers the *-s* in the Goth. simplex *þis*³ as original (= North-West Gic. *-s*), but believes that in the compounds⁴ *þiz-ei*, *-uh* this *s* became *z* because the enclitic particles *-ei*:*-uh* originally bore the chief stress. Prokosch's theory does away with the main objection to van Helten's, but it is highly problematical whether the enclitic particles *-ei*:*-uh* originally bore the chief stress. Grk. *οἰροοί* speaks for Prokosch's theory, but the derivation of *-uh* is still doubtful. If *-uh* goes back to **-unh* (Lat. *quic-umque*) with zero grade of *ŋ* of the negative particle *ne*, this does not speak for an original stress upon *-uh*.

In view of these objections to the arguments in favor of Goth. *-z-* in *þiz-ei* as phonetically correct I venture to advance the analogical argument.

I believe the analogy was not between *s*:*z* alone but between *s*:*z* as contained in the root syllable *þis*-: *þiz-* which was identical in form except for *s*:*z*. The form, e. g., *þanz-ei* would have been less

¹ PBB. 34, 105, Fussn. 1; 36, 435-6; IF. 26, 174 ff.

² Van Helten (PBB. 34, 105, Fussn. 1) admits that the *-ss* in ON *þess* may be in part due to analogy: "... ss könnte hier z. t. auf nachbildung beruhen nach *þeirrar* etc. neben *þeirar* etc. ..."

³ A Comparative Germanic Grammar, Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia 1939: § 93, 3, p. 269.

⁴ Op cit., § 79, 3, p. 234.

likely to influence **pis-ei* because of the discrepancy between *pan-* and *pis-*.

In the following table of the simplex forms I assume Goth. *pis* (< **peso*) to be on a level with the corresponding North-West Gic. forms with -s.

pis: *piz-* (-z > -r in North-West Gic.⁵)

A. *pis*: (1) Gen. sing. masc.-neut. Goth. *pis* = ON *pes(s)*, OE *pæs*, OS *thes*, OHG *des*.

B. *piz-*: (1) Gen. sing. fem. Goth. *piz-ōs* = ON *peir-ar*, OE *pār-e*, OS *ther-a*, OHG *der-a*. (2) Dat. sing. fem. Goth. *piz-ai* = ON *peir-e*, OE *pār-e*, OS *ther-u*, OHG *der-u*. (3) Gen. plur. masc.-neut. Goth. *piz-ē* = ON *peir-a*, OE *pār-a*, OS *ther-o*, OHG *der-o*. (4) Gen. plur. fem. Goth. *piz-ō* = ON *peir-a*, OE *pār-a*, OS *ther-o*, OHG *der-o*.

There occurs in the Goth. paradigm only *one* case of phonetically correct *pis* over against *four* cases of phonetically correct *piz-*. Now, when the -s in *pis* became medial in the compounds **pis-ei*, -*uh*, the -s- was leveled to -z- after the pattern of medial *z* which occurred everywhere else in the paradigm (i. e., **pis-ei*, -*uh* > *piz-ei*, -*uh* after the pattern of *piz-ōs*, -*ai*, -*ē*, -*ō* with or without the suffixes -*ei*: -*uh*). The analogical -z- in *piz-uh* was then transferred to the pronominal forms *hviz-uh*, *anþariz-uh*, etc.

The analogical argument has two points in its favor: (1) It preserves an originally parallel phonetic status of *s*:*z* between Gothic and North-West Gic.; (2) the leveling results in a uniform medial spirant in keeping with the uniform medial spirant *s*:(*z*) in the nominal stems (cf. *agis-is*, -*a*; *riqiz-is*, -*a*) and in the verbal system (cf. *kiusan*, *kaus*:*kusum*, *kusans*). The preservation of a uniform medial *s*:*z* in the nominal *es/os*-stems is phonetically correct,^{5a} but the example of a uniform medial spirant throughout the paradigm could lead to analogical leveling wherever the spirant was both voiced and unvoiced in the paradigm. In the verbal forms *kusum*:*kusans* the original -s- did not become -z- (according to Verner's Law) because the example ⁶ of *s* in the present and in the preterite singular system either prevented Verner's Law from operating or resulted in leveling its effect after it had operated. In

⁵ The North-West Gic. forms are put on a level with Gothic only insofar as *s*:*z*(*r*) is concerned.

^{5a} Due to Thurneysen's law of dissimilation in unaccented syllables.

⁶ Cf. Prokosch, *op. cit.*, § 20, b, p. 63.

the pronominal *pis*: *piz*-forms Verner's Law had already operated, and a leveling of *s* to *z* in the pronominal system is no more surprising than the leveling of *z* to *s* in the verbal system.

Against **pis-uh* > *piz-uh* objection may be raised that an original *s* is otherwise always preserved ⁷ in medial position. But in such cases ⁸ there was no medial *z* in the paradigm, as in the case of **pis*:- *piz-ōs*, etc., whereby leveling of *s* to *z* could take place. If original *-z-* could through analogy vary with *-s-* (cf. *bijandz-up-pan*, Phil. 22: *bidjands-up-pan*, Matth. vi, 7, with *-s* after the pattern of final **z* > *-s* in *bidjands*), there is no reason why original *-s-* could not have been analogically displaced by *-z-* (**pis-uh* > *piz-uh* after the pattern of the phonetically correct *piz*-forms). In the latter case, leveling (in favor of *piz*-) took place because elsewhere in the paradigm phonetically correct *piz*- occurred. In the former case, *-z-* varied with *-s-* because the analogy was confined to the nom. sing. case *bidjand-s(-z-)*.

The argument in favor of analogical leveling of **pis-ei, -uh* > *piz-ei, -uh* does not disprove the phonetic theories, but it deserves a reconsideration, for it is in accord with a definitely established Goth. trend to preserve a uniform medial spirant throughout the paradigm, whereas the hypothesis (van Helten) *pis* ⁹ < **pezo* is a mere assumption in order to account for the *-z-* in *piz-ei, -uh* and at variance with North-West Gic. *-s*.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

A FOURTEENTH CENTURY SCRIBE

The degree to which Adam Scriveyne and his fellows may have warranted Chaucerian strictures on their "negligence and rape" is suggested by a passage in MS. Hm 903 in the Huntington Library.¹ The scribe was copying the *Manuel des Pechiez*² and had written line 9541 when he reached the bottom of column two,

⁷ Cf. Streitberg, *IF*. 18, 392.

⁸ Cf. *was-uh*: *wēsum*; *maguts-u*: *maguts*; *suns-aiw*: *suns*.

⁹ Scholars who consider the *-s* in *pis* as original (*pis* < **peso*) are: Kluge, *Urgerm.*, p. § 235; Prokosch, *op. cit.*, p. 269. Streitberg (*Got. Elementarb.* 5-6, § 114) evidently considers the *-s* as secondary (< **-z*), for under the category "Got. *s* = *urgerm. z*" he places *anparis*: *anpariz-uh*.

¹ Formerly at Everingham Park, the manuscript was purchased for the

folio 52^r. Line 9540 ends with "peche," and when he turned the leaf, his eye lit on another "peche" in the manuscript he was copying, seven lines above, at line 9535. He thus copied lines 9535-9541 twice. The differences are suggestive:

	<i>Fol. 52^r, col. 2</i>	<i>Fol. 52^v, col. 1</i>
9535	de pechiez	dez pechez
9536	(omitted)	chatif (printed text has <i>li</i>)
9537	le regardait	lui regardoit
9538	Et . . . vait	E . . . veait
9539	le ad	lui aed
9540	fut	fust
9541	Lautre	Lautre

In addition to the omission, or the addition, of a word, an error which might occur anywhere, one might notice that in the course of seven lines the scribe employed spellings for nine words varying sufficiently so that many scholars would assume that the differences in spelling represented some difference in language. How much our scribe altered his copy, we cannot know, but he was so inconsistent in his practice that he wrote *de pechiez* and *dez pechez*, *le regardait* and *lui regardoit*, although he had the same copy for both versions, and presumably produced his two copies within a few minutes of each other. Surely such copying goes beyond "negligence"; one wonders if it is what Chaucer called "rape." The scribe must have felt no compulsion to reproduce exactly what he saw before him, and unless he was mixing forms very indiscriminately, he was not substituting spellings which represented his own pronunciation for spellings which represented a different dialect in his copy.

Library in 1925. See Seymour de Ricci, *Census of the Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935), I, 77; William H. Robinson, *Catalogue Number 12* (London, 1925), No. 384; *First Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (London, 1874), p. 45b. It is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Library and to its officials, especially to Colonel R. B. Haselden, who had notes on the manuscript prepared for me when I was in Europe, and to Mr. H. C. Schultz, Curator of Manuscripts, who assisted me in difficult passages with the Library's ultra-violet equipment.

* Frederick J. Furnivall, *Robert of Brunne's "Handlyng Synne," A. D. 1303, with those Parts of the Anglo-French Treatise on which it was founded, William of Wadington's "Manuel des Pechiez" (EETS, o. s. 119, 123; 1901-3)*; ———, *Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne with the French Treatise on which it is founded, le Manuel des Pechiez by William of Wadington* (London, 1862). I will cite the line numbering in the later edition.

The scribe cannot be excused on the ground that he was an inexperienced amateur. In the sixteenth century the manuscript was in the possession of St. Mary's at York;³ it had been executed in the fourteenth century, perhaps toward the middle, and during the first week of some August, fourteen shillings and eleven pence were paid for it.⁴ We should assume from this fact that the book was copied by a professional scribe, and the appearance of the book itself corroborates the assumption. The hand is far from scrupulous, but it is even and clear. It changes but little throughout the manuscript; it appears to be the rapid, steady, somewhat careless hand of a practiced scribe doing a commercial and not very particular job. The pages have guide lines, but the scribe did not feel the need of ruling. There are simple initials, dashed with red and blue, and many pages have indications of the contents, often underlined in red. Marginal abbreviations indicate tales and the favorite monkish subjects. In short, the manuscript, as a piece of book-making, is apparently like thousands of others that emanated from commercial or monastic scriptoria.⁵

CHARLTON LAIRD

University of Idaho, S. B.

³ An inscription on fol. 1^r reads, "*liber monasterii beate marie Ebora-censis emptus per fratrem Clementem Warthwyk qui Alienauit Anathema.*"

⁴ An inscription on fol. 67^v reads as follows: "*ex pensis augusti prima septi mana xiiij.s xj d.*"

⁵ There are many erasures and corrections in the manuscript, but fortunately these do not affect the repeated lines. There are also a number of notes in Latin, French, and English in later hands. One of these records a prayer in English that seems not previously to have been printed:

God almyghtfull
saue al rightfull
Wys alle willefull.
help all nedfull
Gladde alle sorufull.
haf mercy Of alle synnefull (fol. 139^v, col. 2).

Captain Haselden estimates the script c. 1425, a date which agrees with the apparent testimony of the language. I have re-aligned the verse as I suppose it should read; in HM 903 it appears as follows:

God almyghtfull saue al rightfull
Wys alle willefull · help all nedfull
Gladde alle sorufull · haf mercy
Of alle synnefull.

A NOTE ON *SIR GAWAIN* 1795

The writer is at present busy with the task of preparing the glossary for an edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.¹ In that task he has owed much to the kindness and long-suffering of colleagues at his own and other universities.² Having received so much kindness, it would seem incumbent upon him that every so often he should (quite literally speaking) 'unlock his word-hoard' for the benefit of other etymologists and the betterment of his own work. Hence this brief note.

Line 1795—I may bot mourne upon molde, as may þat much lovyes.

The word *may* (2nd *may* of the line) is generally rendered 'maiden, virgin' in ME. literature (*NED*, s. v. *may* sb.¹). Derivation from OE. poetic *mæg*, f., 'kinswoman' is probable (See H. C. Wyld, *Universal Dict.*, N. Y., 1932).³ *NED*, notes that the word *Mæg* often occurs in OE. with the sense 'woman,' and I believe the poet so uses it here: Bercilak's lady is neither 'maiden' nor 'virgin.'⁴ His use of the word with this sense is some indication, even though slight, of the survival of the OE. poetic vocabulary in the N. West Midlands, and hence of the vitality of the alliterative tradition in that region.

HENRY L. SAVAGE

Princeton University

¹ Prof. R. J. Menner of Yale, the editor of *Purity*, had at one time the intention of continuing his study of the unknown poet of the W. Midlands by an edition of *Sir Gaw.* He has very kindly turned over the material he has collected and prepared for that edition to the writer.

² To the following I am particularly obliged and take occasion now to express 'anticipatory' thanks: Professors E. C. Armstrong, H. H. Bender, A. Elsassner of Princeton; F. S. Cawley of Harvard; Kemp Malone and S. Einarsson of Johns Hopkins; Harold Whitehall of Wisconsin; Karl Young of Yale.

³ The most recent editors of *Sir Gawain* gloss *may* as 'woman,' but do not discuss the word.

⁴ The poet uses the word in *Pearl* 435 and 961 in the sense given in *NED*.: in one case to refer to the spotless purity of the Virgin, in the other to the unmarried innocence of the *Pearl*-maiden—yet one is both Maid and Mother, and the other a bride of the Lamb.

TWO NOTES ON *BEOWULF*1. *on stefn stigon* (l. 212)

No editor seems to have suggested that this phrase means essentially anything more than "went on board." However, in the light of our knowledge of the structure and use of early Scandinavian ships it seems more than likely that the poet meant not only that "the warriors went on board eagerly" (*Beornas gearwe on stefn stigon*), but that they took their places literally "in the prow," or "on the forecastle." Vessels of this period were equipped with raised decks at both the forward and after ends, the latter being the part of the ship where the commander and his helmsman had their stations, the former being occupied by a picked band of the ship's most trusted warriors (ON *stafn-búar*, "forecastle men"). This raised forecastle itself came to be called *Stefn*, the term not being reserved to the stem of the ship alone. Since the voyage here described was made under sail no men were needed at the rowing benches, and it is possible that an even larger number than otherwise stood *gearwe* on the ship's forecastle. See Joh. Hoops ed., *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, Strassburg, 1911-1919, art. by W. Vogel "Schiff," pp. 112-3, and Eiríkr Magnússon, "Notes on Shipbuilding and Nautical Terms of Old in the North," *Saga Book of the Viking Club* (London, 1905), pp. 233-4.

2. *wudu bundenne* (l. 216)

Bundenne has heretofore been interpreted as merely meaning "joined," "well joined" or something similar, Schücking going so far as to suggest "eisengeschlagen." In view of the fact that *bundenne* stands alone and unqualified, it is almost certain that this word must apply to the "bound," i. e. "tied up" or "laced," structure known to have existed in North-Germanic and Scandinavian vessels during a period extending at least from the fourth to the tenth centuries. In this type of construction each plank of the ship's hull was worked from a thick piece of timber so that when it was whittled down to the correct thickness, at each frame-station two knobs, one above the other, were left projecting from the plank. These were drilled with holes that lay side by side with corresponding holes in the frame when the plank was bent to its

correct position, and through them linen cord, small tree roots, or some equally serviceable binding was passed in order to secure the planking to the frames. *Bundenne* seems only the most natural, perhaps inevitable epithet for a ship built in this manner.

It is further possible that *bundenstefna* (l. 1910), which has so much puzzled the editors, may be best explained as meaning "laced prow" or, by synecdoche, "laced ship." See Magnússon, *op. cit.*, pp. 214-7; and Vogel, *art. cit.*, pp. 99, 103.

H. LAMAR CROSBY, JR.

Cambridge, Mass.

REVIEWS

The Text of the Canterbury Tales. By JOHN M. MANLY and EDITH RICKERT. The University of Chicago Press, 1940. 8 vols. \$40.00.

The appearance in January of the present year of the Manly and Rickert *Text of the Canterbury Tales* was an event to which Chaucerians have looked forward for years with eager expectation. This enterprise, more extensive in its scope than any undertaken by American scholars since the appearance of Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, was begun in 1924, and since then has engaged the larger share of the time and energies of Professors Manly and Rickert, with the assistance of a corps of trained collaborators. Miss Rickert died two years ago when the work was already nearing completion, having literally sacrificed her life to the task. It was a great source of satisfaction to Professor Manly's friends that he lived to reach the goal toward which he had strained his energies for fifteen years. But they were soon saddened by the news of his death on the second of April, only three months after the work issued from the press. The notable monument which Manly had reared to the honor of his beloved Chaucer thus becomes at the same time the monument to the author himself.¹

Volume 1 is devoted to Descriptions of the Manuscripts. It was probably disappointing to Professor Manly that his exhaustive search through European libraries did not result in any addition

¹ It may not be out of place for the reviewer to state that when he undertook the task assigned to him he did not anticipate that it would be concluded with the somber note of a funeral tribute.

to the list of manuscripts previously known. The text of the early Merthyr fragment, the first page of which Manly reproduces in facsimile (I, facing p. 361) was known to Sir William McCormick and collated by him in his *MSS of the Cant. Tales* (p. 548). However, Manly's thorough and detailed account of the MSS themselves, and his researches into their history and provenance, supply a rich storehouse of information. His descriptions cover a far wider range of topics than even recent Catalogues of Manuscripts, including not only Contents, Form, Collation, Date and Style of Writing, but also Ink, Supervision and Correcting, Illumination, Affiliations and Textual Character, Dialect and Spelling, and Special Features. However, in Volume I the lists of MSS contain some careless slips which do not recur in the subsequent volumes: Phillipps 6570 is given as 6750 (pp. xx and 415); Harley 2251 is given as 2551 (p. xx); Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 3. 3 is given as Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 33 (p. xxi); and Trin. Coll. Oxf. 49 is given as Trin. Coll. Oxford Arch. 49 (p. xxi). "Corpus Christi 198" (p. xix) is listed without distinguishing the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges of this name.

In giving the contents of MSS, non-Chaucerian items are listed with commendable accuracy and completeness. The only omission in this respect which I have noted is in the case of Chetham Manchester 6709 (which Manly himself never saw—see I. 9), where there is no mention of Lydgate's Prayer to St. Edmund or his two Prayers against Pestilence. In his account of the Delamere MS Manly states: "In it four spurious lines, found in no other MS, were written, including an appeal to St. Thomas" (p. 112), but in the account of Phillipps 8136 we read: "At the end of Th is a spurious quatrain alluding to St. Thomas. It is in Bo¹ and Dl, and was probably in Ha²" (p. 423).

In tracing the history of a MS Manly has been at endless pains to identify persons whose names are written on the margins and on fly-leaves. As an illustration, taken almost at random, one may cite his inquiry into the genealogy and provenance of the Agarde family (I. 45-47). Several names of this family, written in 16th-century hands, appear in BM Addit. 35286, some of them recovered by the employment of ultra-violet rays. The identification of these personal names and the tracing of family genealogies, which really constitute separate pieces of research, add important information in regard to the hands through which the MSS passed in their descent to us.

In the examination of the MSS themselves, the valuable evidence to be gained by careful attention to seemingly unimportant details is brilliantly illustrated in the case of the Hengwrt MS, which on account of its vagaries in the order of the tales has long presented a perplexing problem. The importance of this MS has recently been stressed by Tatlock,² who expressed his belief that the Hengwrt

² *PMLA*, I, 133 ff.

MS was written by the Ellesmere scribe and was of even earlier date. Manly, endorsing this conclusion, undertook a more minute and detailed examination of the MS and observed that in different portions at least three kinds of ink were used. By applying ultra-violet rays to the signatures in the MS he established the fact that quires 13-15 according to the present arrangement (including the text from the Monk's Prol. to the Manciple's Prol. and Tale) originally stood between quires 29 and 30 (i. e. between Melibeus and Parson's Tale), thus disposing of Tatlock's elaborate and ingenious attempt to account for the existing disarrangement in this MS (*PMLA*, L, 134-7) and confirming the opinion of Miss Hammond and Sir William McCormick (I. 266-71). Manly observed further that "the make-up of the MS itself indicates at least two stages in its writing" (II. 477). In the first stage the whole of Block D, the Nun's Priest's Tale and several links were lacking. "Later the scribe was able to supply most of the missing material. . . . Perhaps the first [addition] was Block D," which is in an ink "distinctly lighter than that preceding and following" and is inserted in a unique position immediately after Block A. The other additions which "we may assume to have been added later" consist in "the three links of the E-F block, the Mk-NP link and NPT and McPT." "They are all in a bright yellow ink very different from any used elsewhere in the MS" (II. 478).

Restoring the misplaced quires to their original position, we have the following as the order of tales in Hg.

ADB¹F¹E²F²G¹E¹CB²HI

This goes a long way toward correcting the disarrangement which has occasioned so much perplexity. In fact if we shift Block D (which was written later and mistakenly inserted before B¹) and E¹ (Clerk's Tale) to the position between E² and F² the result would be complete agreement with the order of the tales in the numerous MSS of types *bd**. In both type *b* and type *d** the tales of the "marriage group" stand in the order E²DE¹. And outside this "marriage group" there is no difference whatever between the order of *bd** and the restored order in Hg.

Though Manly and Tatlock agree in believing that Hg was earlier than Ellesmere and was copied by the same scribe, they differ widely in their estimate of the relative authority of these two MSS.

Although [says Manly] E1 has long been regarded by many scholars as the single MS of most authority, its total of unique variants, many of which are demonstrable errors, is approximately twice that of Hg. . . . While it has a few lines not in any other MS, and shows some editorial changes that could have been made by Chaucer, it has many others that are questionable and some distinctly for the worse, even involving misunderstanding of the context. Since it is very clear that an intelligent person, who was certainly not Chaucer, worked over the text when E1 was copied, the unsupported readings of this MS must be scrutinized with the greatest care (I. 150).

With this judgment, which from any other pen would have seemed positively irreverent, compare Tatlock's appreciation of the Ellesmere (*PMLA*, I, 129, and n. 78).

Volume II, "Classification of the Manuscripts," with added chapters on The Order of Tales, and Early and Revised Versions, calls for more extended discussion, for it is this Volume which deals with the most controversial problems in Chaucer criticism. In the Introduction to his Classification Manly acknowledges that in the course of his studies his earlier opinions have been distinctly modified. "When we began our work," he remarks, "we knew of the existence only of those variants with regard to which the evidence is clear. As others came to light, we had a difficult question to consider in view of the fact that in many of the tales the text is derived not from a single archetype but from texts which sometimes represent different stages of composition" (II. 39). And as he surveys the completed structure he admits that his classification "must produce so great an impression of complication and variability as to raise the question as to whether it can be correct" (II. 41).

Complicated it certainly is in comparison with the simpler scheme set forth by Manly in his 1928 edition of the CT, though complexity is not necessarily an evidence of improbability. This complexity, in Manly's opinion, is due chiefly to the fact that the extant MSS "do not go back to a single archetype derived from a completed MS of Chaucer's, with tales arranged, linked, and subjected to his corrections and changes, but rather to a body of incomplete material, in different stages of composition and only in part put in order and corrected" (II. 41).

Another cause of the existing complexity is manuscript contamination. In numerous instances scribes shift abruptly from an exemplar of one type to another. In the Merchant's Tale, for example, Manly recognizes three sections: Introduction (E 1245-1690), Tale (E 1691-2318), and Conclusion (E 2319-2418). These are distinguished by changes in the manuscript alignment. While this evidence of extensive contamination presents a vexing problem of classification, it is sometimes of value in throwing light on the development of the text. Manly protests against the opinion of scholars (if there are any such) who assume "that the CT MSS are all derived from a copy which Chaucer put into circulation shortly before his death" (II. 29) and argues that it is altogether reasonable "that Chaucer should have made more changes and additions than appear in the MSS that have come down to us. But the evidence for alterations in the text of CT is much more extensive than we are accustomed to think" (II. 38).

In view of this situation, however, one is moved to inquire why so many pages were devoted to the genealogical method in text criticism, since these processes "can result only in the establishment of the archetype where an archetype existed" (II. 40)—which certainly was not the case with the CT.

Having come to the conclusion that the text of the CT is not derived from a single archetype, the editors were called upon to decide, in Professor Manly's words, "whether we should treat all the variants as if derived from a single archetype or should attempt, before classifying, to distinguish the separate sources and deal with them separately" (II. 39). This latter course, it was seen, presented manifest practical difficulties and for this reason was not attempted. "We have therefore proceeded," Manly continues, "as if all MSS. were from the same archetype, being on the watch, however, for indications of separate origin and separate lines of descent" (II. 39).

I have dealt in some detail with the principles adopted as the basis of Manly's classification because they explain to some extent the contradictions and discrepancies in which he found himself involved through endeavoring to proceed "*as if all MSS. were from the same archetype.*" We are now prepared to consider his classification of the 82 extant MSS and two Caxton prints of the CT. Twenty-five of these MSS, which consist of small fragments or of one or two tales occurring separately, afford such slight evidence that they may be dismissed from consideration. On the basis of the fifty-seven which remain, Manly proceeds "to establish first of all the constant smaller groups, later to study the building up of the larger groups, and finally to deal with the MSS which show few if any affiliations with others" (II. 21). By linking together pairs of very closely related MSS, and using the sigil of the earlier MS underlined to represent the small group to which it belongs (Thus $Ad^3 = Ad^3-Ha^5$; $Bo^1 = Bo^1-Ph^2$) he succeeds in consolidating the lists of MSS into less unwieldy form.

After thus reducing to single units these smaller groups consisting of two or three MSS he next attacks the problem of organizing the larger groups.

In his 1928 edition of the CT Manly declared: "The majority of the manuscripts point to two genuine types of arrangement" (p. 78), but for his earlier Class I and Class II he now substitutes Groups *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d* (I. 25). Nor, even in this four-fold grouping, are all the MSS included. "Besides the members of the four larger groups (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*) there are a number of pairs of variable affiliations [twelve MSS in all]" (II. 70). Moreover, group *a*, which might be taken to represent the earliest type, does not include the three earliest MSS (El, Hg, and Ha^4) nor the two early fragments (Ad^4 , Me). These Manly elevates to a superior rank *above* Group *a*. In his section on "The Ancestor of Group *a*" he remarks: "It is textually clear that the group is not derived from the same immediate ancestor as El" (II. 480).

Thus his classification of the groups presents a situation resembling the lineage of Melchisedek who was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life." The fact that we do not have an original authentic

text of the CT from which to trace the line of development unquestionably presents the most serious difficulty in attempting to classify the MSS.

To the five MSS of group *a* (Cn, Ma, Dd, En¹, Ds), in some tales "other MSS or groups attach themselves temporarily to *a* so closely that *a* does not appear without them . . . In some tales, Dd is either corrected or above Cn and En¹, or (in Cl T) has changed affiliation . . . In other tales *a* represents such a good textual tradition that it shows few errors" (II. 51).

Group *b*, consisting of three MSS (He, Ne, Tc²) and Cx¹, might be expected to occupy a position next after group *a*, but apparently this is not the case, for we read:

As to *b*, the variable behavior of its ancestor, which came into existence later probably than \sqrt{c} ³ or \sqrt{d} , is accounted for by the fact that it was obviously made up in part from \sqrt{a} , \sqrt{Gg} , and \sqrt{c} or \sqrt{cd} . . . Apparently it began with an *a* MS, and its general conception of order was that of *a* rather than of *cd* (II. 43).

With this statement in regard to group *b* may be compared another (apparently penned by Miss Rickert) which appears on a later page:

Chaucer scholars, including Manly, formerly regarded the *b*, *c*, and *d* arrangements as genetically related; but while the *d* pattern is derivable from the *c* pattern . . . the differences between the *cd* arrangements and the *b* pattern suggest that the *b* order was independent of the other two (II. 485).

"Throughout CT," Manly observes, "Group *b* is associated with a variable number of irregular MSS which because of their continually fluctuating combinations cannot be assigned to any constant group. For this larger group in each tale the symbol *b*^{*} is used to designate all MSS associated with *b* in that particular tale" (II. 79).

"The members of Group *b* developed from a common ancestor, not by radiation, as did the two main subgroups of *a*, but by enchainment—i. e. derivation from successive copies" (II. 57). This, however, can hardly mean that the *b* MSS were copied in turn from each other, for in the Pardoner's Tale He (the highest MS of this group) lacks the first three words of line 824 but Ne shows the line complete. And in line 869-70 He reads: "This poyson and into þe next unto man / As fast as evir that he myght be ran," whereas Ne differs notably: "And swithe into the strete vnto a man / As faste as euer he might he ran."

"Group *c* includes Cp, La and Sl², which in some tales are closely related and distinct from *d*, and in others are inseparable from *d*" (II. 62). "Of the three subgroups of the large composite group, *c* represents the earliest attempt to arrange the tales" (II.

³ The sign of the radical is placed over the literal designation of a group to indicate the ancestor of the group in question.

42). This statement, as well as the one quoted above, that the ancestor of *b* "came into existence later probably than \sqrt{c} or \sqrt{d} ," suggests that the alphabetical designations were assigned to these groups before the collation of the MSS was completed.

The largest of the major groups, *d*, includes 13 MSS and "contains with more or less irregularity the subgroups *En*², *Lc*, *Pw* (*Mm-Ph*³-*Pw*), *Ry*² and the single MSS *Dl*, *Ha*², and *Sl*¹ . . . descended by the process of radiation from a common ancestor. . . . Group *d* almost never exists, however, without other MSS temporarily closely affiliated. For this expanded or enlarged *d* the sigil *d*^{*} is used" (II. 63). While the use of this sigil economizes space, it results in some inconvenience to the reader, especially as the MSS represented by *d*^{*} vary from one tale to another. It is stated that the MSS comprising *d*^{*} are listed for each tale, but this promise is not always fulfilled: for example, it is stated (II. 264) that *Bo*¹ *Hk* are "the top MSS in *d*^{*}," but the list of *d*^{*} MSS given for the Clerk's Tale (III. 328) does not include *Bo*¹ *Hk*.

In distinguishing the major groups of the CT MSS Manly appears to base his classification primarily on the order of the tales. "We may place many MSS," he says, "under one of four arrangements or patterns . . . *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, as follows" (I. 25). In the tabulation which follows, group *a* might be supposed to represent the accepted order and *b*, *c* and *d* confusions of the Chaucerian tradition, but if this was at one time Manly's view clearly he ceased to hold it for in his later discussion he denies that Chaucer is responsible for any one of "the prevalent patterns of arrangements in the groups *a b c d*" (II. 476). Elsewhere he objects that "some scholars [have] discussed the evolution of the CT as being represented by a succession of extant MSS, but it is clear that in such discussions only the single feature of the arrangements of the tales was borne in mind and the general characteristics and textual relations of the MSS were entirely neglected" (II. 30). Little difference appears, however, between the method which he criticizes and the criterion which he employs in his own tabulation.

In undertaking to classify the MSS of the CT one must consider also the indications which are to be found in a number of the tales that Chaucer himself from time to time made extensive alterations of his text. "There are some passages," Manly remarks, "in which a small number of MSS have a reading which seems distinctly superior to the readings of the MSS in general, and many other passages where a group has inferior readings, some of which make upon the reader the impression not of scribal errors but of early unsatisfactory readings which were later improved by the original author" (II. 495). For, as Manly declares, "Chaucer's poetry is in the main of so fine a quality that it could not possibly have been produced in a single spontaneous outpouring, but must have been elaborated with critical and loving care before it attained the brilliancy and smoothness which characterize his best work" (II. 501).

In noting individual instances of what are apparently author's alterations, Manly repeatedly observes that the unrevised, and therefore earlier, form of the text is found in MSS of type *d*. But he nowhere recognizes the significance of this evidence in its general bearing on the classification of the major groups. We proceed, therefore, to review the instances of these alterations, as assembled by Professor Manly and Miss Rickert, with particular attention to the situation presented in the *d** and associated MSS.

In the Knight's Tale at line 1906, where there is considerable variation in the MSS readings, Manly remarks:

The simplest explanation of the confusion here seems to be that Chaucer originally wrote the line as it stands in *d**. Then in *O*²—perhaps to avoid hiatus—he stroked out 'side' and placed 'gate' in the margin for insertion before 'westward.' . . . Most of the derivatives from *O*², including Hg El, got the cancellation of 'side' but missed 'gate' (III. 430).

In this Tale, as Miss Rickert shows, "Group *cd* separates at c. 1740, and thereafter Group *d* has along with many lines containing clear scribal errors, a good many readings that are inferior indeed to the corresponding lines in the standard text but do not seem like scribal variants" (II. 496). After citing more than a score of such lines she concludes: "The very number of such differences, together with their restriction to a limited portion of the text, points rather to revision by Chaucer than to a combination of purposeless editing and accident in the ancestor of *d*" (II. 498). To this list two others may be added. In 2655-6 a large group of MSS (including *b**-*c*-*d**) read:

He cryde hoo namoore for it is doon
Ne non shal lenger to his felawe gon.

Manly in discussing these lines suggests that "the couplet of the large group may represent Chaucer's first draft, and the form found in El Hg etc., may be his revision in *O*². MS evidence is not decisive" (III. 434). As to lines 2681-2 which are lacking in *Ad*³ *Dd* *El* *En*³ *Gg* *Hg* *Hk* *Ps* *Py* *To*, Manly remarks: "If these lines were included in *O*¹, they were apparently marked for omission, as they occur only in the *b**-*c*-*d** line of transmission" (III. 434).

In the Canon's Yeoman's Prologue and Tale, "the variants in the text are some of them of such a nature as to suggest that they are not scribal variants but represent two different stages of Chaucer's own work" (II. 498). Manly proceeds to illustrate by citing numerous lines: "We may take *Lc* [a MS of group *d*] as representing the readings of the earlier text and *El* as representing those of the later" (II. 499).

In the Physician's Tale the textual evidence suggests that this tale was first "written for a particular occasion antedating the CT period." He notes (II. 326): "Apparently the Ph Endlink once consisted only of the 12 lines of *Dl*¹ [a MS of group *d*]." These lines, however, did not connect PhT with PdT. "When Chaucer

decided to place PdT after PhT, he apparently first wrote a continuation of the comments on PhT (15 more lines) and then turned his attention to introducing PdT . . . Later he revised the whole link as thus written and produced the version found in El and most other MSS" (II. 326-7). He concludes: "The evidence for two versions is very clear in the Ph-Pd link" (II. 498). The readings which Manly cites to illustrate the unrevised form in both the link and in the PhT are those which appear in group *d*.

"The internal revision" of the Clerk's Tale, as Manly observes, was "not very great, for Chaucer was translating from a definite text and attempting to render it into English as carefully as he could" (II. 500). Nevertheless, he cites thirty lines "which may have belonged to this unrevised version." And, though he does not identify the MSS in which these unrevised readings occur, it is interesting to note that with hardly an exception, these readings are found only in *d* or *d** MSS.

In the Monk's Tale there were two separate versions differentiated by the readings in lines 3568 and 3616 and by the different position given to the Modern Instances. As Manly points out, "The change from 'bastard brother' in 3568 would seem to have been made in consequence of the reconciliation of the claimants to the throne of Spain effected by the marriage of Constance of Castile's daughter Katharine—Pedro's granddaughter—to Henri, the grandson of the bastard Henri of Trastemare. Negotiations for the reconciliation were begun by Juan, Henri's father, in the summer of 1386" (IV. 511). The reading "bastard brother," which was evidently the earlier, is found in the large *Ha⁴-cd** group, and all these MSS agree also in placing the Modern Instances within the tale instead of at the end. Here again the MSS of group *d*, supported in this case by *Ha⁴* and group *c*, represent the earlier tradition.

Our examination of these minor textual details has brought out the significant fact that where differences exist which seem to represent revision by Chaucer himself, the MSS of the *d* group almost without exception follow the unrevised and therefore the earlier form of the text. Let us now turn to certain other passages listed by Manly, some of which afford evidence of structural alterations.

The Man of Law's Endlink (B1163-90) is contained in 35 MSS. "That the passage was written by Chaucer," says Manly, "is self evident" (III. 453). "The link . . . clearly belongs to an early stage in the composition of CT. . . . When Melibeus was transferred to Chaucer himself and the Summoner involved in the quarrel with the Friar, this endlink ceased to have any proper function and became a mere vestigial organ, a sort of literary vermiform appendix" (II. 189-90). Be this as it may; the matter which concerns us at present is that this early link is found in nearly all the *b* c* and *d** MSS, but is lacking in *a Ad³ Bo¹ Bo² Ch El En³ Gg Hg Hk Ps* and *To*.

In the Wife of Bath's Prologue are five short passages (44^{a-f},

575-84, 609-12, 619-26, 717-20) which occur only in manuscripts of the *a* and *b* types and in a few irregular MSS. In regard to these passages Manly concludes:

The most reasonable hypothesis . . . is that they were later insertions by Chaucer himself in a single MS, from which they were obtained by the ancestor of the *ab** group. No MS. outside of this group has all the passages; some have picked up four of them, others only three, one has merely a marginal indication for the insertion of one of the later passages (III. 454).

In the *Somnour's Tale* the large *d** group is split into two divisions. Seven of the twelve MSS of the first division end the tale at line 2158 (Pw Ph³ Ra² Sl¹ Hk Ry²) adding four spurious lines. The other five have picked up the final episode from other MSS. These two divisions of the *d** group are further distinguished in the body of the tale by clear textual differences: whereas *d**¹ is wholly distinct from the text of group *c*, *d**² follows the readings of this group. "It is, then," concludes Manly, "impossible to doubt that $\sqrt{d^{*1}}$ was without D2159-2294, the final episode of the tale. There are two possible explanations: either $\sqrt{d^{*1}}$ had lost two folios (136 lines) or *d**¹ represents an earlier and unfinished form of SuT" (II. 229). The latter explanation is the one favored by Manly.

In the *Clerk's Tale* and *Envoy* we have perhaps the clearest instance of structural revision by Chaucer himself. The *Wife of Bath* stanza (1170-1176) "is lacking in the twenty-four MSS which form Group *d** . . . These MSS not only lack all reference to the *Wife of Bath* but also those having the *Envoy* arrange the last three stanzas so as to end with line 1200" (III. 473).

Furthermore "these MSS, except Tc² and To, lack E 1213-44, the Cl-Me Link, which was apparently not written until after the order of lines at the end of the *Envoy* had been changed" (II. 243). "The next stage would be that exhibited in MSS of the *b* and *c* groups, which have the WB stanza and the lines of the *Envoy* in the usual order. Still later would come the binding of ClT and MeT together by the link (E 1213-44) echoing E 1212" (II. 244). But group *b*, oddly enough, though preserving the order of the tales in group *d** (E²DE¹), also shows the link (E 1213-44) which Manly assigns to the latest stage. With reference to this Cl-Me link (E 1213-44) Manly offers a further explanation: "The compiler of the ancestor of the *c* and *d* groups apparently did not get hold of these lines when he was making up his copy of CT" (III. 473). But how could the compiler get hold of a link which was not composed until later? ⁴ For our present purpose it is sufficient to observe that in the *Clerk's Tale* group *d** again represents an earlier form of the text—whether, as Manly seems to imply (II.

⁴ On the late date of this Cl-Me link see further II. 266.

499-500), the text in this form "was a pre-CT composition" we are not called upon to decide.

There remain to be considered briefly two other instances of author's alterations, in which the evidence points to the same conclusion, although in these cases the situation is somewhat less obvious. The Monk-Nun's Priest's Link exists in two forms: a long form of 54 lines and a short form of 34 lines (omitting B 3961-80). The shorter of these is regarded as the original and the longer as a later expansion. On the basis of the general grouping of the MSS Manly arrives at the opinion "that originally the short form with 'Knyght' in 3957 appeared in the ancestor of *b*-c-d** and in Hg" (iv. 513-4). Thus, it will be noted, the *d** group again ranges itself with those which preserve the earlier state of the text.

The final case to be considered is that of the Nun's Priest's Endlink (B 4637-52). This is preserved in only nine MSS—the five of group *a* (Cn Ma Dd En¹ Ds) and Ch, En² Ad¹ and Ry¹. Judging this case according to all the others which have been considered one would have little hesitation in concluding that since the Endlink is lacking in MSS which ordinarily give us the unrevised form of the text it probably represents a late addition by Chaucer. But in this instance Manly reverses the evidence and decides that the NP Endlink was "Cancelled by Chaucer and originally obtained only by the ancestor of the *a* group" (ii. 39).

Taken as a whole, the textual evidence which we have considered seems to show conclusively that group *d* often represents the unrevised (and therefore the earlier) form of the text, rather than a late and degenerate stage. One may concede freely that the MSS of group *d* compare unfavorably with Hg, El, and group *a* on the score of scribal accuracy and still regard them as deriving from an earlier textual tradition.

Our conclusions from this textual evidence, though not based in any respect upon "the arrangement of the tales," have a direct and important bearing on this question. The problem of the order of the tales is one in regard to which both Manly and Tatlock express themselves emphatically. "Not only," declares Manly, "are the prevalent patterns of arrangements in the groups *a b c d* not the work of Chaucer; there is not a single MS or small group the order of which can be ascribed to him" (ii. 476). The arrangements of the tales in the existing MSS no doubt present inconsistencies, but this is not surprising when one considers that in these MSS both the earlier and later stages of Chaucer's work are represented. For, as Tatlock truly observes, Chaucer "is very unlikely to have left a unified and arranged copy [of the C. T.]." This, however, is far from justifying him in his sweeping conclusion: "None of the MSS, however good, has any authority whatever in determining the order of the groups" (*PMLA*, L. 131).

There is abundant evidence that Chaucer himself, besides making extensive revision in the text of his tales, also shifted their order.

One need only refer to the Man of Law's head-link with its promise of a prose tale, and to the Shipman's tale in which the pronouns betray the fact that it was composed for a woman. Such repeated shifts in Chaucer's plan could hardly fail to result in some perplexity and confusion on the part of the scribes.

Returning now to our consideration of group *d*, it is to be observed that this group, which in numerous instances preserves the earlier textual tradition, likewise shows some notable variations from the standard text in the order of the tales which may represent an earlier stage in Chaucer's plan.

In 23 MSS (among them the very early Hg) the Squire's tale is followed by the Merchant's, with the clumsy substitution of "Marchand certeyn" for "Frankeleyn" in the genuine Squire-Franklin link. This arrangement, however, seems to be directly connected with Chaucer's earlier order of the tales in the Marriage Group (still preserved in 20 MSS: type *d* 13, type *b* 6, anomalous 1) according to which the Merchant preceded the Wife of Bath instead of following the Clerk.⁵ Some scribe and not Chaucer, of course, was responsible for inserting the Marriage Group after the incomplete Squire's tale, and for altering the link. More noteworthy still, in 32 MSS (type *d* 16, type *b* 11, type *c* 3, anomalous 2) the Squire's tale follows the Man of Law's.

It seems not unreasonable, then, to suppose that the order of the tales in group *d* is based upon an earlier arrangement which Chaucer later discarded, though undoubtedly it has suffered some tinkering at the hands of scribes, who patched out some of the remaining gaps with spurious links. This assumption, at all events, is less arbitrary than the sweeping denial of any authority whatever to the MSS.

Is there no significance, for example, in the fact that in the MSS of group *d* (supported in this instance by groups *b* and *c*) the Man of Law's tale is followed by the Squire's and is, moreover, securely bound to it by a link which Manly and scholars generally accept as genuine? It would be inappropriate to digress in a review to consider in detail the problem of the Man of Law's Endlink. It may be noted that Manly, though still insisting that in these lines it was not the Squire who interrupted the Parson, no longer regards either the Shipman or the Somnour as possible for this rôle. But his final suggestion in regard to this link—"It might have been intended for use at a later time in connection with some tale which Chaucer did not live to write" (II. 492)—proposes what is in every way a desperate solution, not only because it seems very unlikely that Chaucer would compose a link in advance of the tale which it was designed to introduce, but also because even this hypothesis

⁵ Elsewhere I have offered what seems a reasonable explanation of the shift in the position of the Merchant's Tale (see *PMLA*, XLVII, 1042, and 1055 ff.).

leaves unexplained the appearance of the Squire's name in this link in an overwhelming majority of the MSS.

An interesting question, on which Manly throws some additional light, is that concerning the circulation of the *Tales* before Chaucer's death. Tatlock in his article on "The Canterbury Tales in 1400" affirmed that "Chaucer especially was unlikely to publish, frequently betraying, as we have seen, solicitude for the purity of his text and his literary reputation" (*PMLA*, L. 105). After rejecting *in toto* the notion that Chaucer himself "ever published this work as a whole in any form," he continues:

To any publication in large parts, or in 'groups,' much of the same considerations applies; few or none of these are not in need of some revision; no 'group' except the first is self-explanatory. I know of no evidence in the MSS favoring the idea. . . . Against publication by Chaucer of single tales or long prologs there is less probability, but no positive proof of it is known.

In regard to this matter Manly expresses himself much more cautiously:

That at Chaucer's death more than one copy of some of the tales . . . may have been in the hands of some of his friends seems not improbable . . . Some of the tales indeed contain passages which strongly suggest that they were written for particular occasions and presented on those occasions to particular audiences . . . And we may feel reasonably sure that Chaucer discussed his literary work with some of his friends and made them sharers of his pleasure in what he had written by allowing them to make copies of some of his tales. These single copies we believe were made use of by the scribes who after Chaucer's death attempted to assemble the parts of the unshaped C. T. (II. 36-37).

Elsewhere we find Manly advancing this opinion more positively: "The textual differences," he remarks, "seem most easily explained by the supposition that some of the editors began with assembling tales which were already in circulation—that is to say, in the hands of Chaucer's more or less intimate friends" (II. 489). Even more significant are his repeated references, in the course of his MS descriptions, to the picking up of "blocks" (i. e. groups) of tales from separate sources. In his account of Corpus (a c MS which he dates "1410-20") he states: "As the links introducing MeT, SqT, and FkT were all inaccessible to the maker of \sqrt{c} , and as he had *these tales in separate booklets* [italics mine], he was able to place them where he thought fit" (I. 95). In the ML Endlink the scribe, Manly supposes, even if he found the reading Somnour at 1179 "would probably regard that as a scribal error for 'Squyer,' as the Summoner was already placed after the Friar." This explanation, it will be noted, implies the existence of Block D in which the Somnour's Tale is included. Again in outlining the process of extending the very early Hengwrt MS to its present form Manly notes that in its first stage the scribe "lacked the whole of Block D," the NP Prol. and Tale and Block H (II. 477). This recognition that

in the year 1400 detached Blocks of the CT were already in circulation is difficult to distinguish from the fascicule theory held by Miss Hammond and Brusendorf but emphatically rejected by Tatlock (*PMLA.*, L. 105 note 15).

One recalls also the Monk's Tale, in which, as Manly shows, Chaucer altered the offending "bastard brother" line, probably not long after the political reconciliation effected in 1386. How does it happen, one asks, that in this line the numerous MSS of the Ha⁴ cd* group preserve the unrevised reading unless they were copied from MSS circulating in Chaucer's life-time?

Manly begins his Chapter, "The Order of Tales," by remarking: "Some scholars have attempted to establish a few typical arrangements as having been made by Chaucer and to derive one of these from another. Inasmuch as the evidence of the MSS. seems to show clearly that Chaucer was not responsible for any of the extant arrangements, there is no reason to discuss the arguments of previous scholars as to his reasons for changes" (II. 475).

But the manifest confusion which scribes have introduced into the MSS should not close our eyes to the very significant agreement in the order of the tales which is exhibited in types *b*, *c*, and *d*:

<i>b</i>	A	B ¹	F ¹	E ²	D	E ¹	F ²	G	C	B ²	H	I	
<i>c</i>	A	X	B ¹	F ¹		D	E	F ²	G	C	B ²	H	I
<i>d</i>	A	X	B ¹	F ¹	E ²	D	E ¹	F ²	G	C	B ²	H	I

That Group A with the General Prologue should be placed first was of course inevitable. But this is the only Group, as Tatlock remarks, which is "self-explanatory." That the others should be ranged in the same order, with only trifling deviations, is truly remarkable if single tales were picked up at random by individual scribes. The *b*, *c*, *d* types, as we have seen, represent in general the unrevised (and therefore the earlier) form of Chaucer's text. And the error in the position of Group G is quite intelligible when one notes that G¹ (the Second Nun's tale) did not contain any topographical indication of its place in the Series. It was not therefore until G² (Canon's Yeoman's T) was added that the position of the Group after B² was established. Just when Chaucer added the Canon's Yeoman's Tale we cannot say, but Manly declares: "It is universally admitted that this is one of the latest pieces of writing in CT" (iv. 521). And this tale is missing in no less than seven MSS, notably exceeding the record of omissions in any other tale.

The noteworthy agreement of the MSS of types *b* *c* and *d* in the arrangement of the tales certainly suggests that it was based upon some tradition which existed even before the revised form of the text. And it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this tradition antedated the death of Chaucer.

Manly has pursued textual investigation of the extant MSS to its utmost limit. None of the extant MSS, however, was made under the author's direction. Moreover, though it is agreed that Chaucer made extensive alterations in the course of his work, the

earlier drafts whose existence we assume have not been preserved. Consequently these must continue to be matters of inference which lie outside the province of textual investigation.

Volumes III and IV consist of the Text of the *Canterbury Tales* with Critical Notes and a valuable discussion of the manuscript glosses (III. 483-527). Manly voices his protest against procrustean methods of dealing with Chaucer's versification: "Certainly lines of trochaic movement, lacking the unstressed syllable of the first foot, are far more numerous in the MSS than any earlier editor has admitted" (II. 40).⁶ In establishing his own text he has not been governed by dogmatic metrical standards but by the evidence which the MSS present. In the first line of the General Prologue he gives an example of his independence of tradition by dropping the final *e* from "Aprill" despite the fact that this leaves us with a headless line. For this relief much thanks! Intelligent readers (and Manly's text is evidently not designed for others) will not be inconvenienced by the fact that the text is not provided with punctuation. Indeed, the reader who is familiar with the fourteenth-century idiom will probably prefer to rely on his own construction of the lines instead of following the guidance of editorial punctuation. Taking the Man of Law's tale as a sample, one notes that Manly's readings usually agree with those of Robinson's text rather than with those of the Oxford Chaucer. Where differences appear it will usually be found that Manly breaks away from the authority of the Ellesmere MS, presumably through preference for the readings of Hengwrt. Examples of this are: *Eut for* And 150, *And for* That 188, *O for* On 466, in the desert *for* in desert 501, *nast for* hast 631, *I holde for* holde I 676, noon *oother* bityde *for* no bet bitide 714, *tath for* taketh 728, of al *for* to al 735, his *lettre for* eek his *lettre* 882, was *for* nas 938, *thogh for* althogh 973, *swowneth for* swowned 1058, *holy for* in holy 1156.

It must be said, however, that for the most part Manly leaves it to the reader to find out by a process of elimination what is his authority for a given reading. In the notes at the foot of the page he occasionally quotes the MS (or MSS) which support his reading—but he does this only occasionally. And in the Corpus of Variants he cites only variant readings—thus recording in full the MS evidence *against* his reading but not that which he is following. His citations, so far as I have checked them, are free from errors.⁷ The text follows the Ellesmere order of the groups but retains the Oxford Chaucer's designation of the groups by letters, with a resultant alphabetical confusion in the arrangement: A B¹ D E F C B² G H I. Moreover, the line-numbering of the Oxford Chaucer

⁶ See also his note on Prol. 217 (III. 423).

⁷ This observation may be extended to a general commendation of the proof-reading throughout these volumes. Such a typographical error as in the Volume No. XLVIII instead of XXVIII in the top line of II. 36 is an isolated exception.

is preserved. As a result B 1190 stands in vol. III, p. 231, and B 1191 in Vol. IV, p. 109.

The Critical Notes appended in Vols. III and IV—slightly over a hundred pages—are confined almost wholly to textual matters. These Notes traverse to a considerable extent critical problems also dealt with in Vol. II under Classification, Order of Tales or Early and Revised Versions. There is also some duplication of information presented in the Descriptions of MSS in Vol. I and to a less extent of that supplied in the Corpus of Variants (Vols. V-VIII). Consequently the reader who seeks information on a particular question is in many cases under the necessity of searching for it in several places. But at all events he has reasonable assurance that his search will be rewarded.

And if he haue nat seyde hem leue brother
In o book he hath seyde hem in another.

Volumes V-VIII—one half of the entire work—are devoted to the Corpus of Variants. In these volumes Manly records the variant readings presented in all the 82 extant MSS and fragments (the textually worthless description of the Parson in Ad⁴ is printed *en bloc*, v. 42-43). This prodigious task was simplified by the ingenious system of line-by-line collation on cards, which Manly explains in detail in II. 1-9. This system also provides a means of checking the readings and thereby virtually eliminates the possibility of error. Without the employment of some such system the compilation of this Corpus of Variants would have been impossible.

The casual reader of Chaucer, it is safe to say, will pass these four volumes by with a shudder. But one who wishes to get the complete MS evidence in the case of a particular line or phrase will be grateful to find here the exact data which he requires.

Within the limits of a review it is impossible to discuss all of the separate essays which have been included in this *magnum opus*. But special attention should be called to Margaret Rickert's valuable study of Illumination in the Chaucer MSS (I. 561-605). The text of her study is illustrated by facsimiles from the MSS themselves.

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

Edmond—Puxi—Michel, les Prénoms de Trois Enfants. Par
ANTOINE GRÉGOIRE. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres;
Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 188.

Ce livre contient trois études sur des formations linguistiques faites spontanément par les mères de trois enfants à propos de leurs prénoms et observées attentivement à l'insu des mères, par des

pères avertis et qui ont dû, entre parenthèses, "y prendre un plaisir extrême." Ces mères avaient en effet, à des degrés divers, le don de créer des appellations nouvelles et variées en présence des nouvelles formes d'activité de leurs enfants et des différents événements du milieu familial où se déroulait leur enfance.

Ces études sont intéressantes et instructives: écrites avec une sympathie souriante où perce un brin d'humour, elles n'en sont pas moins des rapports scientifiques exacts. L'importance de leurs résultats consiste en ce qu'elles nous font assister à des actes de création linguistique authentique dans des conditions bien définies. On y trouve souvent la confirmation de lois générales connues mais qui s'éclairent d'un jour nouveau.

Ainsi l'une d'elles, la mère d'Edmond, a tiré du nom du bébé d'abord *Monmon*, puis *Ponpon*, nullement, observe l'auteur et je le crois, sous l'influence du nom commun *pompon*. Ceci est curieux et montre à quel point la sémantique l'emporte sur la phonétique dans les associations d'idées: ceci explique aussi que le jeu de mots fasse rire par la surprise causée par la perception d'un rapport phonétique habituellement ignoré. La mère d'Edmond a ensuite créé toute une série de diminutifs: *Monmonnet*, *Monmignonnet*, *Monmignonnette*, *Monmonnette*, *Monnette*, etc., et chaque innovation est placée dans son milieu circonstanciel. L'observateur analyse ou interprète l'attitude, l'état d'âme de la mère dans l'acte de création; le tâtonnement et l'échec possible de l'innovation et sa rapide élimination: par exemple *Monmonnesse* pas très adapté à un garçon! On remarquera que toutes ces innovations ont laissé intacte la syllabe principale du nom *Mon*.

Par contre, le deuxième enfant *Puxi*, le fils de M. Spitzer, a reçu de sa mère, trois mois après sa naissance, le surnom de *Pückchen*, diminutif de *Puck* (cf. *Puck* de Shakespeare), car son prénom officiel, Wolfgang (de Wolfgang Goethe) ne semblait pas, instinctivement, à la mère, correspondre au petit bonhomme. Puis suivit une série de diminutifs, *Pucks*, *Puxi*, etc. Bientôt cependant, à l'occasion du don, fait à la mère, d'une gravure portant le titre de *Tüdelüt*, elle appellera le bébé *Tüdülütchen*¹—plus tard un livre lu par elle produira pour l'enfant le surnom de *Kabäuschen*; à l'occasion d'un article qui l'avait intéressée elle lui donnera les surnoms de *Tchnudelbützchen*, *Schnültzchen*, etc. Cette mère, active innovatrice, aura rattaché son enfant, par ces surnoms successifs, aux impressions multiples différentes éveillées en elle par des événements intérieurs d'origine diverse.

Le troisième cas, celui de Michel, est le plus étudié: il remplit en effet la plus grande partie du livre (pp. 50-167). La mère d'origine méridionale française, mariée à un Belge, l'Edmond de la première partie de ces études, vivant plus ou moins à l'écart et

¹ Innovation facilitée peut-être par la succession d'*üs* qui arrondissent les livres comme pour un baiser.

isolée dans la banlieue de Bruxelles, s'est consacrée presque exclusivement à son enfant. En l'espace de trente mois elle lui a donné près d'un millier de noms différents, se dédommageant ainsi, semble-t-il, de la perte de son soleil provençal. Du point de vue psychologique, il y a là évidemment le phénomène remarquable d'une sorte de production intense sous pression. Toutefois, il y aurait lieu de distinguer entre des appellations de circonstance assez ordinaires et d'autres plus intéressantes linguistiquement. Lorsqu'elle appelait son bébé *Monsieur de la Fontaine*, avec variations telles que *Fontaine de Jouvence*, par une allusion facile à comprendre, il n'y a pas entre cette mère et les autres, beaucoup de différence. Bien des enfants ont été appelés: *Cassetout*, *Cassepot*, après avoir cassé quelque objet, etc. Ce qui caractériserait ici la mère de Michel serait peut-être un recours plus grand fait aux souvenirs savants, littéraires, ou de simples lectures. Par exemple, l'appellation imagée toute naturelle de *Petit Poussin* lui suggérerait *Nicolas* (cf. *Nicolas Poussin*); ou bien, *petite rosse* (?), *Rossini*.

Mais où elle se montre décidément originale, à mon avis, c'est dans l'emploi intarissable de diminutifs s'accrochant à toutes sortes de mots: *grinchonot*, *grinchonu*, *grinchonette*, *grinchonichonette*, *ma toute belle*, *ma toute bellonette*, *ma toute belline*, *ma toute bellichonette*. Alice (puisque'il faut l'appeler par son nom) en a employé 494, vingt-huit de plus que n'en avait mentionné Nyrop. Le gros de ces créations correspond à des périodes d'exubérance: celle des trois premiers mois qui ont suivi la naissance, et surtout le troisième mois où la santé de l'enfant bien affermie a complètement rassuré la mère.

Ces phénomènes n'ont pas intéressé que les linguistes. Les écrivains qui ont aimé les enfants ont contemplé avec attendrissement ce jaillissement d'appellations où se divertit et s'épanche le cœur maternel. L'auteur cite V. Hugo (*Les Misérables*, IV, I):

La petite se nommait Euphrasie. Mais d'Euphrasie la mère avait fait *Cosette* par ce doux et gracieux instinct des mères et du peuple qui change Josépha en Pepita et Françoise en Sillette . . . Nous avons connu une grand'mère qui avait réussi à faire de Théodore *Gnon*.

Il cite aussi M. Duhamel (*Les plaisirs et les jeux* I, VII) qui parle d'un prénom Jean, devenu *Zazou*, puis *Tioup*, *Zapiou*, *Dabio* et en définitive *Babou*. Ce sont là, si je puis dire, des évolutions organiques: on imagine, en effet, facilement le prénom *Jean* prononcé d'une façon enfantine *Za*—puis par répétition de la consonne et additions du suffixe hypocoristique "*ou*" (*loulou*, *chouchou*) *Zazou*, etc. Le témoignage de ces écrivains a de la valeur. Il serait bon d'en faire un relevé systématique pour les différentes périodes.

En résumé ces études suivies (en appendice) des notes de plusieurs autres observateurs ont un intérêt à la fois psychologique et linguistique. Admettons que nous savions, ou du moins, que nous

suppositions que toute innovation linguistique est un phénomène individuel, ces observations nous en apportent une preuve considérable. De même si nous sentions que ces innovations sont de caractères, d'espèces bien différentes suivant les personnes innovatrices et les conditions dans lesquelles elles se réalisent, nous le voyons ici manifestement. Il est probable que d'études similaires multipliées se dégagerait, entre autres, une connaissance plus précise, plus intime du processus de la création linguistique, de sa variété, de sa souplesse, de ses heureuses réussites et aussi des résistances qu'elle rencontre dans le groupe social. Ce dernier point n'a pas été ou à peine considéré dans le livre de M. Grégoire. Je crois cependant qu'il a son importance.

HENRI F. MULLER

Columbia University

"*Ansejls de Mes* according to Ms. N (Bibl. de l'Arsenal 3143), text, published for the first time in its entirety, with an Introduction" (Columbia University diss.). By HERMAN J. GREEN. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1939. Pp. 459.

De cette publication d'un texte long de presque 14600 vers, hérissé de difficultés, et qui a dû coûter beaucoup d'efforts à l'éditeur laborieux, je ne me sens compétent de juger qu'au point de vue linguistique, et, de ce point de vue exclusif, je ne puis malheureusement dire trop de bien. Une lecture rapide, au petit bonheur, particulièrement des notes et du lexique, m'a révélé beaucoup de bévues. Mon premier regard a été attiré par la note au v. 2959: "*flere*—historical infinitive! This word, which obviously is derived from the Latin *flere*, does not appear in Godefroy." Le passage en question se trouve dans la scène de l'enterrement de beaucoup de "vassaux" dans le moultier de Saint-Seurin: les corps ont été portés au moultier:

Devant aus font porter mainz estaval
Et mainte crois dont sont d'or l'enseignal.
Li ensenz *flere* et amont et aval
Toute la nuit dusque chantent li gal,
Que ce leverent li moine natural
Por enfoir les cors de tant vassal. . . .

2959

On se demande comment un infinitif historique (sans la prép. *a ni de!*) d'un verbe inconnu dans toute la Romania et abandonné par le latin vulgaire (v. Loeffstedt, *Philolog. Komm.* p. 320), sans évolution de *ē* → *oi*, pourrait se trouver dans un texte a. fr. du XII^e siècle. Et qu'ont à faire dans cette scène macabre des enfants? Lire: *li ensenz flere* = 'l'encens embaume' (*flairer* intransitif au sens de 'exhaler de bonnes odeurs' est attesté par le

FEW à partir du XII^e siècle). De même j'étais frappé par la note au v. 11282: "au maille—neg. expression: there was nothing at all left when he was through"—mais *maille* (soit de *macula*, soit de *medialia-metallea*) est du féminin! Il s'agit d'une ville autrefois riche, maintenant dévastée:

Et Berengiers a la cité saisie,
De toute au maille, n'i a remés demie.

Même dans la théorie de l'auteur, on ne comprend pas *demie*. Lire: *de toute aumaille n'i a remes demie* 'pas la moitié d'une pièce de bétail n'y est restée.'

Au v. 6248 l'auteur lit *Sire, ale m'ant, Je vos commant a Dieu omnipotent* avec un subjonctif inattesté, pour ne pas accepter *Sire Alemant* dit à un Flamand. Mais au v. 4829 des messagers sont envoyés *par Alemaigne duques a Saint Quentin* et voir sur la confusion d' 'Allemand' et 'Flamand' *Neuphil. Mitt.* 1936, p. 98.—Au glossaire on lit: "*aposée*—betrothed, wife; may connote idea of marriage contract or possibly idea of putting hands on bride as token of possession"—mais toute cette pseudo-étymologie symbolisante (*apponere manus*?) s'évanouit si nous considérons *aposée* comme variante de *esposée*, cf. *apouse* variante de *espouse* dans God. et au contraire *espostre* à côté de *apostre*.—"assonager"—'to sound right or harmonious', malheureusement sans indication du vers en question. Mais il faut probablement lire *assouager* (angl. to assuage).—"batestaus" (Picard form for batestal) noise, excitement"—je ne vois rien de picard dans une forme normale du paradigme.—"*charchier* (10804)—chercher?" Il s'agit du vers *Dites, signor, quant vodrez vos charchier?*, qui figure dans un discours où Berengier exhorte ses amis à piquer en mer pour attaquer Anseÿs, donc = *charger* (le bateau pour partir), cf. les formes *carchier*, *charchier* dans God.—"*moisselez* (12551)—?" il s'agit de l'expression *denz moisselez*, qui n'est pas inconnue, puisque God. a *dens maisselés* 'mâchelier.' Pour la labilisation cf. *armoïre*, *émoi* etc.—"*noiauz* (8178)—here noyau is a neg. word like *mie*, *point*, etc." Non point! *de cest est noiauz* contient a. fr. (*ne valoir*) *noauz* = *nugalius*, REW 5989.—"*noster* (12827)=noter?" Biffer le point d'interrogation puisque -s- graphique se trouve tant de fois dans notre texte, p. ex. *-este* dans le diminutif *-ette*.—"oïst (9284)—goes out (from oïssir)." Le vers est: *Le depesassent si que l'en oïst en France*; on ne voit pas l'interprétation de l'éditeur. Lire *oïst*?—"osteus (9965)—probably part of a harness." On impose un carcan à Alori, qui dit: *Cis osteus est moult griés*. J'interprète naïvement: 'cet hôtel est très dur' avec cette pointe d'humour macabre qu'a notée l'éditeur aux vers 8591, 8592. Cf. fr. *être logé à la même enseigne*, au sens ironique, et, pour le sens mélioratif, *Lanval*, 153-154.¹—"tonellement (6345)—uproar?" (*tot le mois furent en grant tonellement*). Mais God. donne plusieurs exemples de *toucillement* et identifie le mot dans notre passage même; d' a. fr. *tôillier*, angl. *to toil*.—"voie (6359)=vivant." Comment un reflet de *vivus* pourrait-il avoir *oi* de *ē*? Le vers est: *N'est hons qu'est voie qui ne s'en espoent*, donc: 'il n'y a homme qui voie cela . . .' (avec *est* pron. dém. archaïque).

Il ne faudrait pas mettre au glossaire des formes avec ? sans indication du vers (p. ex. *tovre*). Il y a beaucoup de passages que l'auteur a laissés sans commentaire ou dont il n'a pas vu les diffi-

¹ Delez li s'est el lit couchiez:
Or est Lanval bien herbergiez.

cultés—d'une façon générale, les explications données au lexique et au glossaire ne suffisent absolument pas.

v. 2868 *Qui l'ot [un cheval] isnel nel donast por Melaus*. Le mot *Melaus* est identifié avec le Ménélas de l'Odyssée, qui est véritablement mentionné sous la forme *Meliaus* au v. 4516. Mais que voudrait dire 'il n'aurait donné son cheval pour Ménélas'? je comprendrais à la rigueur 'pour la belle Hélène', mais pour le pauvre "... las qui s'avance"? Lire *nïelaus*, cf. *neëlé* 'or ciselé, émaillé' (de lat. *nigellu*) = **nigell-alis*?

v. 2950 [charniers] *Ou font les morz retor par dedenz laire*. L'éditeur explique *retor* 'a refuge or resting place', mais n'identifie pas *laire*. Pense-t-il à l'inf. *laire* 'laisser' ou à *l'aire*?

v. 4516 [la belle Hélène] *Que Meliaus conquist puis a l'acier Quant cil de Troies furent tot escillié*. Le ms. porte *por*. Mais la correction *puis* ne s'impose pas parce qu'Hélène "Troja . . capta, Aïax eam interficiendam esse proposuit, sed mox, sine sorte, Menelao conceditur teste Dict. Cret." (Forcellini-De Vit). *por alacier* signifie 'par tromperie, stratagème' (*alacier* 'allurer'): le stratagème de Ménélas était d'adjuger le palladium à Ulysse, non à Ajax qui voulait faire tuer Hélène, et de gagner ainsi le support d'Ulysse pour la reconquête de sa femme, voir *Roman de Troie* vv. 27054 seq. (au v. 28430 de ce roman *dame Heleine* est désignée par les mots *par cui sont li regne essillié*, qui rappellent le vers de notre texte *quand cil de Troie furent toz escillié*).

LEO SPITZER

Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo. A cura di LUIGI DI BENEDETTO.
(Scrittori d'Italia, n. 172.) Bari: Laterza, 1939. 265 pp.
Lire 25.

Fifteen years have passed since Luigi Di Benedetto published in the *Classici italiani con note* (Utet) a volume of Dolce Stil Novo poetry: a small volume which has done good service and held its place as the best text for the poems of Cavalcanti, Gianni, Alfani, Frescobaldi and Cino. Since its appearance many important studies have appeared on all of these poets. Michele Barbi's studies on the text of Dante's *Canzoniere* have resulted in a much clearer idea of the manuscript tradition on which the Stil Novo corpus must rest. Biographical and historical implications have been explored. The reading of single verses has been discussed and tested by what can be brought from without as contributing doctrine or prevalent lyrical sentiment. The closed garden of the Stil Novo has not gone uncultivated.

With the present volume of the well-known Laterza series, Di Benedetto has turned again to the manuscript sources for his texts

and has followed more closely the definitive results of Barbi in grouping and evaluating them. He has expanded the volume to include all the known poems of Cino da Pistoia (only a selection of them was given in *Utet*) and has included all of the poems of Guido Guinicelli (*Utet* contained only *Al cor gentil . . .*). The poems of Lapo Gianni and Dino Frescobaldi are increased and a number of verses are restored to the latter's *Morte avversara . . .*. In only one respect is the present volume reduced in comparison with the preceding: those "rime di corrispondenza" by others than the above, compositions which elicited or replied to poems of theirs, are not given. And in truth, they would have added great convenience to this collection as they did to the former. Obviously they cannot be ruled out as not forming a part of Dolce Stil Novo poetry, since a good third of the present collection would have to be eliminated if such a criterion were strictly held. It is simply a question of convenience, as is the label which we continue to extract from a particular episode of the *Purgatorio* and use in our own lax way to the detriment, one often fears, of a more penetrating understanding of just what that poetry is.

That we do not understand these texts in their entirety is a confession which surely even the specialist will be prompt to make. And even the specialist will wish that this volume, at least, of the Laterza series might have had its commentary (in many cases a prose paraphrase is the best form) such as accompanied the *Utet* volume. For there are considerable changes in this body of texts as compared with the former reading, and as a result the *Utet* commentary is no longer adequate. To cite only a few out of many examples: *vil raggio* becomes now *virago* and *di me ti dole* now stands *di te mi dole* (p. 38); *saluto risivo* becomes *salutorio sivo* (p. 78); *d'Amor mi tolga Morte e dia pace* now reads *d'Amor mi tolgon molto ond'è ho pace* (p. 96). In many cases it is impossible to say, without turning again to the manuscript sources, whether these are improved readings or not. Probably the *vestita a donuzza* (p. 68, *Utet*) is rightly corrected to *vestita d'un'uzza* (p. 58: cf. another example in the sonnet attributed to Dante: "Sennuccio, la tua poca personuzza . . ."). On the other hand, the *fore* in verse 16 of Cavalcanti XXIV must surely be *fiore* reinforcing the negation. In Cino XVI (p. 119), in two cases *altra* should probably stand as before: *alta*; and the *Mero* on p. 217 should remain *Nero* as before and in other texts.

Again, without access to manuscript sources, no sure judgment can be made, in the case of Cino's poetry, of the respective merits of the present text against the critical edition by Zaccagnini (*Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum*). Di Benedetto has profited by the latter's work, but the two remain at considerable variance, in text and to some extent in attribution.

All in all, the present edition of the Stil Novo may well be the best to date. Likewise, it may well not be the best possible. There

is even now a fresh critical edition of the same texts in progress by another scholar. Perhaps when he has done his work, Di Benedetto's can be better measured. Another critical edition is the only adequate criticism of a critical edition.

C. S. SINGLETON

Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit. Herausgegeben von HERMANN GERSTNER und KARL SCHWORM. München: Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf. [1939]. Pp. 622.

Although a survey of contemporary literature must be more or less wanting in balanced historical perspective, it is always refreshing to find enterprising spirits who have the temerity to tackle the perennially new problem of literary orientation. Such books have recorded some puzzling misjudgments; but they have also recorded the current views and hopes of their authors and have thus provided for later generations the best possible markers for charting the constant shifting of literary tastes and movements.

This book presents fifty-three authors in alphabetical order. There is a portrait of each author, a sample of his handwriting, and his signature. The personal data, being autobiographical as far as possible, not only list the most noteworthy events in the author's life, but also reveal something of his attitude towards the world—and often towards his own works. Each author's principal works are listed, briefly described, and monotonously praised. The feature of greatest value in the book is the anthological presentation of four to six pages of text from each author. Some of the selections are published here for the first time and many are not easily accessible elsewhere.

The publishers' foreword indicates that the mission of the book is to win readers for the "neue Dichtung." The statement is made that "die Jahre der entarteten Dichtung endgültig überwunden sind," and that the Third Reich has a wealth of writers who conform to the laws of their *Volkstum* and are not concerned with purely aesthetic values. A few "typical representatives" of the older generation are presented alongside of the men and women whose productions root directly in the present.

Who are representative of the older generation? The eldest of the authors discussed are four men born before 1877; they began publishing before 1908. They are: Adolf Bartels (1862-1939; published since 1889), who is designated as a literary historian, "ein unermüdlicher völkischer Kämpfer für die Reinheit des Blutes," who treated the racial question "selbstverständlich in unserem völkischen Sinn"; Dietrich Eckart (1868-1923; published

since 1904), friend of Hitler's and Rosenberg's, promoter and editor of the Party's *Völkischer Beobachter*; Otto Erler (1872—; publishing since 1899), who shows in his dramatic works a "starke Einfühlungskraft in das Werden unseres Volkstums"; and Ludwig Finckh (1876—; publishing since 1900), a physician-poet "so eng mit dem Boden und Herkunft verwurzelt" that he has composed no less than ten books on *Ahnenkunde*.—Obviously these are not the authors whom earlier critics have considered representative of German literature.

The next seven authors began publishing before the end of the war. They include: Friedrich Bethge, Heinrich Zerkau, Robert Hohlbaum, and Hanns Johst. Between 1919 and 1933, twenty-six others put forth their first works. Among them are: Richard Euringer, Werner Beumelberg, Johannes Linke, Eberhard Wolfgang Möller, Edwin Erich Dwinger, and Herybert Menzel.

Sixteen approved authors have made their appearance since the founding of the Third Reich. In 1933: Kurt Eggers, Carl Maria Holzappel, Anne Marie Koeppen, and Hans-Jürgen Nierentz. In 1934: Hans Baumann, Fritz Helke, Kurt Koelsch, and Gerhard Schumann. In 1935: Ferdinand Oppenberg and Otto Paust. In 1936: Quirin Engasser, Fritz Stelzner, and Tüdel Weller. In 1937: Hanns Gottschalk. In 1938: Martin Damss and Hannes Kremer. Some of these are represented to date by only one book, but this first volume evidently meets the standards laid down for the present survey.

The number of "literary" prizes mentioned is impressive. There are few authors in this book who have not received at least one prize—even if nothing greater than the second lyric prize of the magazine, *Die Dame*. Another very striking thing in this anthology is the value placed on Party connections—even in the discussion of literary efforts. One gradually begins to understand that the "wir" of the foreword ("... dass wir ausserdem einen beglückenden Reichtum von Dramatikern, Lyrikern, und Epikern besitzen") means "We, the Party."

One of the most significant contributions to the anthology is the part of Friedrich Bethge's address, "Krieg und Drama" (pp. 51-56), delivered before the *Theatertagung der HJ* in 1937. One phase of the argument runs: Aeschylus and Cervantes knew the value of war for the poet. Goethe was too conciliatory to be a great dramatist. Neither Kleist nor Hebbel was able to give his best, because the *Volk* did not demand it of them. Grabbe would have been a great dramatist if there had been a war in his time. . . . Yet Bethge fails to mention any great drama produced as a result of the last War.

Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit contains a wealth of information about the group of contemporary writers it presents. While from a literary point of view it is uncritical both in respect to selection and discussion of authors, it is very definitely a record of the

directed efforts of Third Reich literary activity. Most of the biographical sketches have been reproduced in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in shortened form. (Münchener Ausgabe, early 1939).

EDMUND E. MILLER

University of Maryland

Lessing's Dramatic Theory: Being an Introduction To And Commentary On His Hamburgische Dramaturgie. By J. G. ROBERTSON, Late Professor of German Language and Literature in the University of London. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1939. x, 544 pp. \$8.00.

This posthumous work of the late Professor J. G. Robertson, of the University of London, is of such encyclopedic proportions that it is about as easily reviewed as a volume of the *Britannica*. The work as it lies before us today was not quite finished by its author. However, he left it in such a condition that its publication has been made possible. The editor, Edna Purdie, has lightened the task of the reviewer by verifying all references and quotations: in and of itself a herculean performance.

Professor Robertson has left practically nothing for his successors to do so far as factual matter is concerned. We have here an account of the founding of the Hamburg theater with all necessary documentary evidence, its staff, the repertory (with full information about each and every play and the cast at each performance), a brief notice of Lessing's two earlier theatrical journals, his connection with the enterprise, all of his briefer or more detailed criticism of all the plays performed with all quotations given in the original and divided according to the national literatures to which they belong, and finally a discussion of what Professor Robertson calls in his title "*Lessing's Dramatic Theory*." With the exception of the last section this represents a mine of information for which future students will bless the author's memory. Nothing has been omitted except the stage versions of the plays performed, and Professor Robertson informs us that he could also have furnished these. To the present reviewer the great value of the book lies just here, namely, as a handbook of facts about the theater at Hamburg and everything connected therewith. Because of its very nature it makes for hard reading, but that does not lessen its value as a reference work.

The title of the book is an unfortunate one. The sub-title would have served the purpose better. When one considers the nature of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* and the circumstances under which it was written, one immediately understands the impossibility of attempting to find in it any conclusive theory of the drama. For what does it consist of? Desultory notes on plays acted, diplo-

matic remarks about the actors, attempts to make the publication look like a periodical, rambling statements on all matters pertaining to the stage and the drama, contradictory presentations of what Professor Robertson considers the main purpose, all sorts of padding such as the long quotations and the detailed account of the contents of the Spanish *Essex*, and finally the discovery on the author's part that the so-called national theater in Hamburg was serving mainly as a vehicle for the presentation of plays of French origin in German translation or German imitations of such plays. Although he denied knowing what patriotism meant, his national pride finally aroused him to an examination of these masterpieces which national vanity and conceit claimed to be perfect representations of Aristotelian theory, to say nothing of their having even surpassed the old master's conception of the drama. And the worst of it all was that all other nations, including the Germans, believed this and attempted to follow in their wake.

The results of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* should be looked upon as rather negative than positive. It represents the effort to cast down the French idols by showing that they were false gods, and the best way to do this was in the strictly biblical fashion by condemning them out of their own mouths. Furthermore, how under the circumstances mentioned could Lessing have formulated his final views on the subject of dramatic theory? These scattered remarks, contradictory as they are in some instances, cannot be patched together in such a way as to show that here we have Lessing's last words on the subject. It was sufficient to have put Aristotle on the throne and to have showed that the French claims were bogus ones.

We grant that he resorted to exaggeration to prove his point, but it is unfair to accuse him of unfairness toward Voltaire. We but need to think how Lessing would have fared, had Voltaire caught him between a Lessing and a Gotthold Ephraim correspondence such as Lessing reveals between Voltaire and his double, Lindelle. It is also beside the point to discuss Lessing's attitude toward Shakespeare upon the basis of the fact that he did not discuss him in detail in the *Dramaturgie*. Where could this have been done? No Shakespeare play was given, and all his remarks, such as they are, always take their starting point from the plays presented upon the Hamburg stage.

It also must be taken into consideration that Lessing spent a most unhappy time during his stay in Hamburg. Nowhere in his correspondence during that period does he display much interest in his work there. One would rather gather from his correspondence that the *Antiquarische Briefe* were much closer to his heart and absorbed a much larger part of his interest than what was supposed to be his main occupation in that town. He refers to his theatrical periodical as "diesen Wisch" and has very little to say about it. In the language of the eighteenth century the *Ham-*

burgische Dramaturgie represents rather "Kollektaneen zu einer Theorie der Tragödie" than a real final and conclusive production.¹

Whether he would have elevated Aristotle to the position of dictator of tragical theory if the French had not claimed him as their authority, may remain unsettled. To the present reviewer it has always seemed as if Aristotle grew upon Lessing in the course of the discussion until he finally made the famous statement that Aristotle is an infallible in his field as Euclid in his. As a true son of the eighteenth century, Lessing was by his very nature bound to base his criticism upon the dictates of reason, upon something which might be proved; hence the indispensability of Aristotle. Authority rather than psychology was the chief thing.

In spite of the fact that Lessing was an omnivorous reader, we might quarrel with the author of this splendid book in his too great inclination to discover the sources for everything which Lessing has to say. But we shall keep out of this dangerous territory where investigators usually lose their way and, instead of not seeing the woods for the trees, see more than are actually there.

Although we still hold fast to the opinion that the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* represents a step backward in the history of the theory of the drama, that its main importance is a negative one, and that in some respects Johann Elias Schlegel anticipated the future development better than Lessing, we should like to close with Professor Robertson's last statement as it best sets forth the underlying idea of the book: The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* "is not merely, in all essentials, the greatest dramaturgic text-book of its century: it represents in general the most advanced thinking which Europe had attained at the close of the third quarter of that century. We may not be able to learn from it much knowledge which we can apply to the drama of to-day. . . . But even so, we can and do learn from it the best that the eighteenth century thought about the drama of its own age."

ROBERT BRUCE ROULSTON

The Johns Hopkins University

Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile. Edited by WALTER WILSON GREG. No. 1. *King Lear, 1608 (Pied Bull Quarto)*. Pp. viii + lxxxiv. No. 2. *The Merchant of Venice, 1600 (Hayes Quarto)*. Pp. viii + lxxvi. No. 3. *The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602*. Pp. viii + lvi. London: The Shakespeare Association, and Sidwick & Jackson, Limited, 1939. 10/6 each.

Minute study of the textual and bibliographical problems of the early Shakespeare quartos has hitherto been restricted for the most

¹ Cf. Fünfundneunzigstes Stück.

part to the few who had access to the extremely rare originals. It is something of a reproach to scholarship that the quartos, with the five¹ notable exceptions of *Hamlet* (Q₁, Q₂), *Pericles* (Q₁), *Richard II* (Q₃), and *Titus Andronicus* (Q₁), have not even been available in satisfactory facsimile, for the unreliability of the Ashbee facsimiles² and of the photolithographic series by Griggs and Praetorius is well known. There has been serious need for reproductions that are wholly above suspicion of "improvement" or sophistication. To supply this deficiency the Shakespeare Association has initiated a series of collotype reproductions of the earliest quartos under the editorship of Dr. W. W. Greg. The first three have just come from press, and they meet every expectation. The bindings are attractive, and the beautifully clear collotypes give the effect of the original paper and ink. There is no retouching, no hardening of lines, no tampering of any kind. The quartos are reproduced with such fidelity that for most purposes there is no occasion to refer to the originals.

Each facsimile is preceded by a brief introductory note by Dr. Greg which gives the entry in the *Stationers' Register*, explains the system of line numbering, and locates extant copies of the quarto.³ Some of the comments naturally invite comparison with corresponding sections of Miss Henrietta Bartlett's new *Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709*, published almost simultaneously. The first facsimile, the Pide Bull *Lear* (1608), is a reproduction of the Gorhambury copy, containing the unique blank

¹ J. S. Farmer's facsimile of *Richard III* (Q₁) is based on Ashbee's facsimile; Augustin Daly's reproduction of *Merry Wives of Windsor* (Q₁) is derived from Griggs.

² These are almost as rare as some of the quartos. Only fifty copies of each were prepared; and of these Ashbee and J. O. Halliwell-Phillips certify that nineteen were immediately destroyed, leaving only thirty-one sets, of which J.O.H.P. at once used two for collation. Though Ashbee made facsimiles of the forty-three then known quartos published in Shakespeare's lifetime (including *Hamlet* Q₂, both 1604 and 1605), and also of *Othello* (1622), *Venus and Adonis* (1593, 1594), and *Lucrece* (1594), Sir Edmund Chambers lists only the *Titus Andronicus* (1600) and Farmer's reproduction of the *Richard III* (1597) in his bibliographies in *William Shakespeare*, Vol. I.

³ He also singles out every reading which a defect in the basic quarto has rendered doubtful or illegible in the collotype, excluding from consideration "those due to defects in the original type (such as broken letters and misshapen stops) which therefore occur in all or some other copies." But these last are still *lectiones difficiles*, and in my opinion they deserve attention. For example in *King Lear*, D₁, line 4, the comma after "perforce" is not recognizable, and the apostrophe in "would'st" at E₁, line 16, is almost imperceptible; in *Merchant*, F₁, the catchword "hee" is unaccountably faint; in *Merry Wives*, F₂, line 3 from bottom, "Gillia of Brainford." is partly obscured by the ink coming through from F₂, and the catchword on E₄ has a faint character following -es in "Godes" in both the collotype and the Folger copy. As this last illustration shows, the difficulty is not in the reproduction but in the original. But in these and similar cases, scholars would welcome Dr. Greg's editorial guidance—in fact, they are almost helpless without it.

leaf preceding title which is unknown to Miss Bartlett. The collation in future must be given as π^2 , B—L⁴. The Roxburghe copy (British Museum) of the Hayes quarto of *The Merchant of Venice* (1600) is the original of the second facsimile. Owners may wish to note that the W. A. Clark copy is now in the library of the University of California (*Census*, p. 57). A serious discrepancy exists between the two descriptions of the 1602 quarto of *Merry Wives*. Dr. Greg, who reproduces the Huth copy in the British Museum, prefixes the signed preliminary leaf A from the Capell copy at Trinity College, Cambridge, with the statement that this leaf "is wanting in all copies except those in the Bodleian Library and at Trinity College, Cambridge." Miss Bartlett, on the other hand, while agreeing about the British Museum and Trinity College copies, notes that the leaf is wanting in the Bodleian but is present in the Folger and Huntington copies. I can give no information about the copy at Huntington, but in the Folger quarto leaf A₁ is a positive photostat.

Another important section of the prefatory note is devoted to press corrections and a record of the formes which exist in two or more states. It is no detraction from the value of the facsimiles to point out how very helpful it would be if to the collotype of the basic quarto had been appended facsimiles of the variant states not found therein. In the case of *Merry Wives*, no variant states have been noted. *Merchant* could have been cared for by the addition of one leaf bearing on the recto a facsimile of G₄^r and on the verso one of K₂^r (not noted by Greg; the Huntington Library *Check-List* of 1919 records that the Kemble-Devonshire copy has the remarkable reading "intergory" for "intergotory" in line 8). *Lear*, however, would have presented a serious problem, for no fewer than twenty-two additional pages (on eleven leaves) would have been necessary to give all the variant states not found in the Gorhambury copy. Such a twenty-five percent increase in the number of collotypes would have increased the cost appreciably. The matter was doubtless considered carefully by the publishers, but the advantages of having within the covers of one book *all* the states of the various formes are so great and so obvious that a modification of policy seems desirable.

Dr. Greg and the Shakespeare Association are to be congratulated on their initial success. The facsimiles will prove indispensable to students of the minutiae of Shakespeare's text and of the bibliographical problems of the quartos. Here for the first time are the plays reproduced with absolute fidelity, and made available at a small fraction of the cost of photostats. Every library and every serious Shakespeare scholar will want to possess the series. It is to be hoped that subscriptions will be so numerous and so prompt that the future of the series will not be placed in jeopardy.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Folger Shakespeare Library

The effects of his political life upon John Milton. By PAUL PHELPS MORAND. Paris: 1939. Pp. 124.

De Comus à Satan, l'œuvre poétique de John Milton expliquée par sa vie. By PAUL PHELPS MORAND. Paris: 1939. Pp. 262.

Dr. Morand's two books offer a complete survey and reinterpretation of Milton's life and poetry. They are very able works showing a thorough acquaintance with the literature of their subject and deserve most careful consideration. The author believes, against the prevalent view, that Milton changed greatly in his beliefs and feelings; and the change came principally from his experience of politics. The crucial period was that of his employment by the Council of State under the Commonwealth. The first book studies this period in detail, the second applies to the whole of Milton's poetical career the conclusions reached in the first book.

Morand takes as his basis Liljegren's researches on Milton's biography and his attacks on Milton's personal integrity. He goes over the same ground and with fine judicial impartiality weighs the evidence for and against Liljegren's contentions. He pronounces Liljegren's facts correct but his conclusions from those facts mistaken. Milton *did* abett the insertion of the Pamela prayer into later editions of *Eikon Basilike*, he *did* consent to act as censor in spite of *Areopagitica*, and he *did* behave unscrupulously in attacking Morus as author of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* after he had learnt that Morus never wrote it. However, his motives were not personal but political. Milton kept his private integrity: as a politician he allowed the ends to justify the means.

What do Morand's results amount to? They are important not because they are new but because, as he presents them, they are reasonable. They thus force us to face facts which we've really been aware of but which most of us have shirked. It doesn't much matter whether or not Milton helped the Pamela forgery, but it does matter that we should face the monstrosity of the whole Pamela passage in *Eikonoklastes*. Milton knew *Arcadia* well and with it the context of Pamela's prayer. He must have known the solemnity of that context, its close relation to the spirit of Protestant sufferings and martyrdoms alive in Sidney's time. We cannot avoid the conclusion that Milton was prepared to sacrifice truth to an immediate political end. He identified himself with the dishonesties and fanaticisms that any minority ruling by power is forced into. In dealing with Milton's part in politics Morand is just, perspicacious, and temperate.

How far this theme can be applied to the whole of Milton is another matter. It should be allowed a closer application than is usually made. But Morand in his general book carries the process too far. His picture of the early Milton, on the whole Christian, not without mysticism, and social-minded, is plausible, though I

disagree with his notion that *Comus* is devoid of realism and that the clergy-passage in *Lycidas* is a prophetic accretion. But that Milton was quite obsessed by a political puritanism which rendered him incapable of repentance and uniformly self-justificatory I cannot agree. Doubtless the trend of politics accounted for much of that conflict of motives in *Paradise Lost* of which Morand gives a brilliant and searching account impossible to criticise properly except at length. But beneath the political fanaticism and the strident abuse or self-justification of the later pamphlets there always remained a core of good sense and wisdom. The *Ode to Rouse* proves where Milton's heart truly was, while Adam's humility in his final talk to Michael, Milton's distrust of action evidenced in *Paradise Regained*, and the repudiation of patriotism in the latest of his letters all suggest that Milton had repented of the part he took in politics, a repentance not the less fundamental because never paraded. Nor is *Samson* purely pessimistic. Manoa's final assurance that all the valiant youth shall resort to Samson's tomb is like the mood that closes *Lycidas*: the mood that sets little store by results and great store by the state of mind that is ready to act appropriately; the very reverse in fact of that political opportunism which Morand describes so well. In sum we must give more attention to Milton's political career but not all that Morand would have us give.

There is much else in Morand's general book besides his main thesis. I must mention especially his theory of composite characters in *Paradise Lost*. For instance the Satan of heaven and hell is a different character from the tempter and serpent. It is a most interesting theory which may not only solve difficulties but explain why *Paradise Lost* has paucity but not poverty of character.

E. M. W. TILLYARD

Cambridge University

Walter Bagehot. By WILLIAM IRVINE. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939. Pp. 303. \$4.50.

Professor Irvine's *Walter Bagehot* is a compact and accurate summary of the life and writings of President Wilson's favorite Victorian critic. It deserves to become the standard book of reference for those whose requirements do not obligate them to go directly to Bagehot's works. But it adds little unknown material. Mrs. Russell Barrington has let Professor Irvine use certain unpublished letters of Bagehot's that shed more light on his personality as a student at school. But Mrs. Barrington had already done a surprisingly good job for a relative on Bagehot's life and so had Mr. R. H. Hutton for a friend.

There remained a need, however, for a summary of Bagehot's

opinions on politics, economics, and literature. Satisfied to describe the circumstances of their composition, Mrs. Barrington had left their content alone. Professor Irvine's account is satisfactory to the extent that he limits himself to the immediate task. Bagehot was a Victorian Liberal of conservative tendency, who, like Arnold, believed in making haste slowly in matters of social change. But, unlike Arnold's, his own criticism was that of a man of practical affairs, banker and writer for economic journals, who differed from other journalists not in the spontaneity of his output (he was at the opposite pole to Arnold here), but in possessing a sounder and more extensive background of information and an independence of social position as well as a temperament which permitted him sincerity in addition to verve.

All this Professor Irvine gives us, and he is conscious also of Bagehot's limitations when the personal judgment of literary worth gives way to reasoning about esthetic principles. In criticizing Bagehot's theory regarding the distinction between the classic and the romantic, Irvine sensibly comments:

The truth is, no doubt, that he did not know what he meant. By faulty definition and by careless use of terms, he has built up around his ideas just such a verbal screen as he once complained of in other writers. The basic fallacy of his theory lies of course in his use of the word *type*, the inconsistency of which he veils from himself by introducing the corresponding and broader term *literesque*. *Literesque*, closely identified with the typical, is defined as 'fit to be put into a book.' But what is fit to be put into a book may or may not be typical. It was therefore possible to use *literesque* correctly throughout the discussion and at the same time shift the meaning of *type* at convenience. Bagehot's strict employment of the one term probably blinded him to the loose employment of the other (p. 102).

This is a clear distinction of terms, such as modern Humanists are accustomed to make. We wish Professor Irvine had stopt here, and not proceeded to suggest that, lurking in such ambiguities, were the principles of Humanism itself. "A critic who has principles for the judgment of books will presumably have standards for the appraisal of writers. These standards Bagehot nowhere defines, yet everywhere implies" (p. 138). We think that in himself implying Bagehot's Humanism (as Irvine does more explicitly elsewhere), Irvine is not only getting beyond the necessities of his subject, but falling prey to the sort of ambiguity of which he has complained. Humanism, I take it, holds clarity of definition an essential principle. And even the implications of Humanism in Bagehot, I believe, are not altogether consistent. I find them (in contrast to Arnold's criticism) at times too close to the morality of commerce and utilitarianism in the Victorian era for such ready classification. It would have been better had Irvine not sought to remove the ambiguity from Bagehot's implications.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM

New York University

Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858. By THOMAS CARLYLE.

Edited by R. A. E. BROOKS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xxxviii + 222. \$2.75.

In editing this manuscript, now at Yale University, Professor Brooks has done well his two-fold task. First, he has made accessible a new piece of Carlyle's writing: the account of a month-long journey undertaken in order to study twelve of Frederick's battlefields. The account, crowded with observations on places and people, is written in a style resembling that of the journals and letters. And the immediate meaning of this allusive record is made easy by the editor's map, emendations,¹ explanations, and index.

And, second, the editor has interpreted the broader significance of the record. He has shown the relation of *Journey to Frederick the Great*, and has made that relation throw light on Carlyle's method of writing history. The mass of evidence on these points is presented in twelve appendices. Each appendix compares one battle-account in *Frederick* with the account of the same battle in *Journey*, and with the numerous accounts of that battle in various source-books from which *Frederick* derives.² And each appendix closes with a consideration of Carlyle's artistic handling of the scene in *Frederick*. These detailed comparisons, summarized in the Introduction, show "Carlyle's integrity as a historian in finding and dealing fairly with his facts," and show, to some extent, "how he made his accounts graphic as well as accurate" (p. xxxvii).³ Thus, in his treatment of Carlyle's artistic-historic method, Professor Brooks supplements—and is supplemented by—the work of Professor Harrold and of Mrs. Young.⁴

As Professor Brooks frequently reminds us, this study is limited to only a part of the materials gathered for *Frederick*. To generalize about the development of Carlyle's artistic manner of presenting historical materials, one must go back over a quarter of a century. On August 12, 1834, Carlyle wrote Emerson: "The story of the [Diamond] Necklace was the first attempt at an experiment." *Frederick the Great* was his last great attempt.

HILL SHINE

Maryville College

¹ Read *interwedged* for *interwedges* (p. 61); *20,000* for *20,00* (63); *descried* for *described* (64).

² It is worth noting that Archenholz's work, an important source of *Frederick*, was one of the first German books that Carlyle ever owned.

³ Elsewhere in the Introduction (xvii-xviii), Brooks gives new evidence on Alexander Carlyle's questionable editorial practice.

⁴ Harrold he acknowledges (vii, xxxii). But Louise M. Young's valuable *Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History* (Philadelphia, 1939) appeared too late for use. Incidentally, the present book will convince Mrs. Young that Carlyle wrote from notes.

Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain. By JAMES A. S. McPEEK.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 411.
\$5.00. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, xv.)

Pursued with intelligent method the study of influences will yet render fundamental services to literary history. Clearly, however, if a classical author is chosen, it is not good method to study his effect on English literature before serious studies have been made of his influence in Italy and France. The question of intermediaries raises too much uncertainty. Mr. McPeck has struggled hard with his bad method, has indeed made some interesting discoveries, but more often he is only able to record his suspicion that an undiscovered Continental imitation may intervene between Catullus and a given English poem (pp. 106, 111, 119, 132, *et passim*). This is not enough when a better method can largely control these intermediate borrowings. McPeck's way logically entails studying at once the entire European influence of Catullus, and this can only be done superficially. Thus his acquaintance with modern Latin writers apparently extends little beyond Gruter's *Delitiae*; and we lose confidence when we find 'Scaliger' (which?) called a 'medievalist' (p. 285), or Joannes Secundus a German (p. 152), or encounter Ludovicus Areostus and Adeodatus Seba (pp. 333-4) instead of Ariosto and Beza. And if Pontanus, Marullus, and Politian 'are not entirely representative of humanism in Italy' (p. 275), then who is? The need of a better control of intermediaries is clear on p. 204. Here it is said that Jonson 'boldly and happily effects an innovation' in a theme of Moschus, and 'without doubt' does so by recalling Catullus. The 'innovation,' however, had already been attached to this theme by Baif, from whom Jonson may well have taken it: see *A. J. P.* 49 (1928), 121, 130.

On the other hand the general repute of Catullus in England is justly estimated, and special credit is due to the treatment of the interrelations of English poems derived from Catullus. Within his limits ('through the age of Pope'), the author has searched widely, though not exhaustively: I note at random the omission of John Owen and Thomas Pope Blount. More might have been discovered about Catullus in the schools. Thus there was a selection from him in the *Epigrammatum Delectus* used at Eton from 1686 onwards.

Space remains for a few details. Of what use is it to list the poems of Catullus imitated by an English writer without references to that writer's works (pp. 284, 288, 387, etc.)? Misprints occur on pp. 48 (Jonson's), 279 (naisi), 281 (*Fanus*), 283 (cuisdam), 295 (qusto), 296 (*Rima*), 308 (1559), 328 (lompido), 334 (Aeodatus). French accents are badly treated, e. g., 'interrompués' (p. 342). Sir John Davies (pp. 289, 361) is absent from the Index. And what fancy impelled the author sometimes

to print Latin hexameters as distichs (pp. 23, 149, 151, etc.), and again to print elegiac distichs at times as if they were hexameters (pp. 62, 88, 126, etc.)?

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

BRIEF MENTION

The German Popular Play "Atis" and the Venetian Opera. A study of the conversion of operas into popular plays, 1675-1722, with special reference to the play *Atis*. By MARY BEARE. Cambridge University Press, 1938. Schon in der Einleitung ihres Buches betont Miss Beare, dass das Volksstück *Atis* "a considerable historical and sociological interest, if little intrinsic literary value" habe. Wir haben es also nicht mit Literatur im höheren und engeren Sinne des Wortes zu tun, sondern mit jenen unterirdischen Strömungen, die Stoffe wie diesen aus der pompösen Opernwelt Venedigs in das deutsche Volksstück und die "Haupt- und Staatsaktion" geschwemmt haben. Es handelt sich um die Vorfahren der deutschen Burleske des 17. Jahrhunderts, aber darüber hinaus gleichzeitig um eine der wichtigsten Kulturadern der europäischen Welt. Die Tatsache, dass das Wiener Volksstück aus der italienischen Oper in das Volk abgesunkenes Kulturgut ist, ist nicht neu, ebenso wenig wie die Einsicht in die Rolle, die das Jesuitendrama der Zeit in diesem Vorgang spielte. Das Verdienst der vorliegenden Arbeit besteht vielmehr darin, die im grossen bekannten Züge anhand eines aufschlussreichen Einzelfalles im kleinen genau nachgezogen zu haben. Die Geschichte des *Atis*-Textes ist überzeugend erzählt. Als Quelle ist Minatos Oper *Creso* anzusetzen, die im Jahre 1678 für den Wiener Hof in Prosa übersetzt wurde. Dieser offizielle deutsche *Creso* wurde 1684 von Lukas von Bostel für die Hamburger Oper zu einem Singspiel umgearbeitet, das den Titel *Der Hochmüthige, Bestürzte und Wieder-Erhobene Croesus* trug. Im weiteren Verlaufe zeigt sich, dass der Stoff—wie in so vielen Fällen—sehr bald von der Wanderbühne aufgenommen (möglicherweise von der Truppe Haacke-Hoffmann), durch Deutschland getragen und nach Wien zurückgebracht wurde. Das vom Theaterdirektor Hoffmann hergestellte und (jedenfalls in Wien) benutzte Manuskript, jetzt in der Wiener Nationalbibliothek, steht in Miss Beares Untersuchung zur Diskussion. Die Verfasserin hat eine Fülle von Material auf dem engsten Raum zusammengetragen und (besonders für den englischen

Leser!) geordnet. Das Buch sollte, seiner Klarheit und Gründlichkeit wegen, in jede Darstellung des 17. Jahrhunderts hineingezogen werden.

Southwestern College

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Masters of Dramatic Comedy and Their Social Themes. By HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xxiv + 430. \$4.00. Professor Perry has written one of the best surveys of comedy—written it after wide reading and proportionate reflection, which have given him a proper respect for “one of mankind’s most precious and elusive possessions,” but also with gaiety and wit. Whether or not laughter can save the world in our time, there is nothing in sight that seems more likely to save it; and Mr. Perry is a profound believer in the social salubrity of comedy and in the theater as its best vehicle. His book is an exhilarating history of the art, chiefly (but not exclusively) in terms of certain great practitioners. If it has a fault, there is possibly an occasional lack in appreciation of the importance of uncorrective laughter. Most comic dramatists have composed primarily to entertain; and there is often more poetry, and usually more liberation, in really inspired clowning than in Meredithian tinkling. Here and there, in the chapter on Molière for example, one feels the least bit of bias in the judgment of certain plays. Mr. Perry writes learnedly and gracefully on Aristophanes, Plautus, Terence, Jonson, Lope de Vega, Molière, Holberg, Goldoni, Lessing, Raimund, Gogol, Turgenev, Chekhov, and Shaw. The works of these masters are described with gusto, and there is just the right amount of connective summary and conclusive generalization, as well as a carefully selected nine-page bibliography of critical and historical works in English. The author has let Shakespeare alone, since his contribution to world comedy is “a thing apart” and “should be so treated.” Mr. Perry confides that he would like “some day . . . to make the attempt.” Readers of this book are certain to concur in hoping that he will.

H. S.

Mr Cibber of Drury Lane. By RICHARD HINDRY BARKER. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, no. 143. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 280. \$3.00. This study is carefully documented: it rests partly on a new search of contemporary manuscripts, pamphlets, and periodicals; and, while the organization is biographical, it includes judicious appraisal and displays a command not only of

the subject but also of the period. The Bibliography, restricted to works by or attributed to Cibber, might profitably have been extended to books and articles about him. No doubt Professor Emmet L. Avery's "*The Craftsman* of July 2, 1737, and Colley Cibber" (*Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, VII, 90-103) appeared (June, 1939) too late for notice. Mr. Avery's verdict, that the effusion signed "*C. C. P. L.*" was not written by the Poet Laureate, is surely the only possible conclusion; but the sting in the letter's allusions entitles it to mention. Mr. Barker writes with an easy grace and a quiet relish of Augustan and Georgian foibles that would have won the approbation of the great men whom he introduces in the comedy's minor rôles. Pleasant glimpses, in several cases more than glimpses and occasionally very intimate ones, are afforded of Betterton, Steele, Pope, Gay, Fielding, Garrick, and Johnson. Sometimes it is as if we saw a familiar figure with new eyes, because all these eighteenth-century worthies are presented in the Cibberian perspective. Though the airy Colley retains the center of the stage, the author does not try to pull a pair of buskins onto him. There is no attempt to palliate his failure as a poet; on the other hand, he receives all that is due the theatrical merit of his plays, the excellence of his impersonations, and his effectiveness in literary controversy. Like the heroes, if it is proper to call them such, of the true comedies of manners, Cibber is indebted to his defects for his existence. His liveliness loses nothing in the pages of Mr. Barker's solid and entertaining book.

H. S.

The Gast of Gy, ed. R. H. BOWERS. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1938. Pp. 51. This edition was published as Heft xxxii of Max Förster's *Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*. It gives us a hitherto unprinted prose text of this ME devotional treatise, a text recorded in MS 383 of Queen's College, Oxford. The text proper is followed by a collation with the Vernon text (as printed by Horstman), and by a glossary limited to "obscure words and strained meanings" (p. 49), though few of the words there listed are properly so described. An introduction of seven pages gives us a summary statement about the history, versions, and authorship of the dialogue between Guy's ghost and the prior. The new text, diplomatically printed, will be welcomed by those interested in ME religious prose.

K. M.

INDEX

SUBJECTS

- Alliteration, Poetic** — 388.
Alsop, Richard —, "A Hartford Wit" 319.
American Criticism: Kulturkritik und Literaturbetrachtung in Amerika 152.
American Fiction 1774-1850: a Contribution toward a Bibliography 400.
American Folklore: Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois 402.
American Poetry: Primitivism and Decadence, a Study of American Experimental Poetry 152.
Ames, see Milton.
Anglo-Latin Writers, Books Known to — — from Aldhelm to Alcuin 240.
Anglo-Saxon, see Old English.
Ansej's de Mes 624.
Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert 201.
Atis, The German Popular Play — and the Venetian Opera 640.
Bagehot, Walter 636.
Balzac, Paris dans la Comédie humaine de — 157.
Banks, John, *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex* 221.
Baudelaire, A Self-Estimate by 297; see also 482.
Beowulf
 — 241; Two Notes on — 605;
 William Taylor of Norwich and — 210.
Bible, The Literature of the English — 237.
Biography, A Parasitical Form of — 289.
Blackwood's Magazine, see Neal, John.
Boccaccio
 — in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure 241; *Il Filocolo* 69; *Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di Diana* 69.
Bridges, Robert, The Dates of Some of —'s Lyrics 199.
Brown, Tom — of Facetious Memory: Grub Street in the Age of Dryden 234.
Browning, Revision in —'s Paracelsus 195.
Brunanburh 74.
Brut y Brenhinedd 160.
Büchner, Georg: Der Drucker des Hessischen Landboten 512.
Burke, Edmund
 — and his Kinsmen: a Study of the Statesman's Financial Integrity and Private Relationships 307; —'s Error Regarding Sugar-Crystals 47.
Burns, Robert, Pride and Passion, — 1759-1796 229.
Byron, A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in —'s Don Juan 39.
Carlyle, Thomas
 — and the Art of History 550;
 Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858 638.
Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639.
Censorinus, see Shakespeare.
Champmeslé, Is la Coupe enchantée by La Fontaine or — ? 105.
chanfrein 134.
Chaucer
 — and the Liturgy 357; —'s Archangel 259; —'s Monk 350, 480; —'s *Shipman's Tale* and *Ser-cambi* 142; —'s *Taillynge Ynough, Canterbury Tales*, B² 1624 262; Arcite's Maying 207; "As by the whelp chastised is the leon" 209, 481; Jacob and the Hooly Jew 254; A Possible Provençal Source for —'s *Hous of Fame*, 300-310 342; Some Further — Allusions 361; Source of the Quotation from Augustine in *The Parson's Tale*, 985 211; The Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 606.
chaufrein 134.
chest 378.
Chrétien de Troyes: Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman 222.
Churchyard's Description of the Queen's Entertainment at Woodstock in 1592 391.

- Cibber
Colley and Caius — 393; Mr — of Drury Lane 641.
- Cinema: Are We Movie Made? 322.
- Coleridge
—: a Biographical Study 227; Organic Unity in — 227; —'s "Metrical Experiments" 432; The Life of S. T. —: the Early Years 466; Wordsworth and —: Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper 466.
- Colonne, Guido delle, *Historia Destructionis Troiae* 78.
- Comedy: Masters of Dramatic — and their Social Themes 641.
- Conduct Books: Some Plagiarisms in 17th Century Books of Advice to Children 416; see also English Books of Instruction for Princes.
- Conrad, Joseph 316.
- Corneille
The Date of Mme Deshoulières's Parody of *le Cid* 451; The Date of the *Cid* in English 575.
- Corpus Christi Play, see English Mystery Plays.
- Courtesy Books, see Conduct Books.
- Criticism
The Personal Heresy, a Controversy 233; Rehabilitations and Other Essays 235.
- Dallas, E. S. — in Trollope's *Autobiography* 422.
- Day, John, A Second Version of —'s *Peregrinatio Scholastica* 35.
- Defoe
—'s First Poem 314; —'s *Review* 218; Evidence for —'s Authorship of *The Memoirs of Captain Carleton* 430.
- Dennis, John, The Critical Works of — 315.
- Deor, Four Text-Notes on — 204.
- Deshoulières, The Date of Mme —'s Parody of *le Cid* 451.
- Desportes 579.
- Diderot
La Correspondance de — 472; The Dates of —'s Birth and Death 31.
- Donne's *Paradoxes* in 1707 53.
- Drummond, William, Un Sonnet de — et son point de départ dans la *Semaine* de Du Bartas 493.
- Du Bartas, see Drummond, William.
- Ecclestone, Edward, Milton and —'s *Noah's Flood* 183.
- écrier* (s'), The Rise and Fall of — in French 323.
- einem den Hahnenfusz unterbreiten* 366.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, The Letters of — 231, 425.
- English: The Literature of Slang 473.
- English Books of Instruction for Princes: Englische Fürstenspiegel vom *Policraticus* Johannis von Salisbury bis zum *Basilikon Doron* König Jakobs I. 241.
- English Drama
The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero 456; Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights 456; English Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642 536; Five Elizabethan Tragedies 456; The Invisible World. A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama 455; Modesty in the Audience 570; References to the Drama in the Mildmay Diary 589; The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy 77; Some Notes on 18th Century Essex Plays 176; The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625 540.
- English Language and Literature, Annual Bibliography of 239.
- English Literature
Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639.
- English Mystery Plays: A Note on the Relation of the Corpus Christi Procession to the Corpus Christi Play in England 83.
- English Novel, The History of the —, Vol. x—Yesterday 552.
- English Poetry
Elizabethan and 17th Century Lyrics 239; Studies in Metaphysical Poetry 456.
- English Prosody: The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude 455.
- English Theater, see English Drama.
- escharevotée 'écorchée'* 447.
- Essex, Some Notes on 18th Century — Plays 176.
- Faust Book*, see Marlowe.
- Fiction, Recent Works on Prose — Before 1800 54.
- Flaubert, *Une Nuit de Don Juan* 516.
- Fortnightly Review*, The Party of

- Humanity, *The* — — and its Contributors, 1865-1874 302.
- French
- Edmond — Puxi — Michel, les Prénoms de trois enfants 621; Studies in — Language and Mediaeval Literature 557.
- French Literature
- Hommes et œuvres du xx^e siècle 158; 19th Century French Readings 320.
- Fuller, Thomas
- The Formation of —'s "Holy and Profane States" 147; *The Holy State and the Profane State* 147. *funk* 265.
- Galloway and the Romances 363.
- Galt, John, *The Gathering of the West* 316.
- García Gutiérrez
- 's Birth-Date 296; A Note on the Sources of *Venganza catalana* 454.
- Garrick, David, The Journal of — Describing his Visit to France and Italy in 1763 560.
- Gast of Gy*, *The* 642.
- Gautier d'Aupais, A Monetary Question in — — ? 338; see also 561.
- Gawain and the Green Knight* 159, 604.
- Gentleman-Cully (The)* 396.
- Gentleman's Magazine (The)*, The First Magazine, a History of — — 305.
- George
- 321; Briefwechsel zwischen — und Hofmannsthal 67.
- German, Forms of Address in — (1500-1800) 298.
- German Literature: Problems in German Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries 543.
- German Poetry: Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit 628.
- Gleim, Vier Briefe aus —'s Freundeskreise 433.
- Goethe
- 's *An den Mond* 509; *Hexenfexen. Faust II*, L. 6199 117; Rousseau and Faust 581; *Urfaust* L. 309 201.
- Gothic *pis* 599.
- Gracián, Baltasar, *El Criticón* 556.
- Grobiana's Nuptials*, The Text of — 109.
- Guérout 579.
- Guido de Columnis, see Colonne.
- Guillaume de Wadington, see William of Wadington.
- Hahnenfusz, Einem den — unterbreiten* 366.
- Haller and Wieland 110.
- Hardy, Thomas, Rebekah Owen and — 316.
- Harper, George McLean, Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of — 466.
- Harvey, Gabriel: "Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo" 418.
- Haust, Jean, *Mélanges de linguistique romane offerts à M.* — 401.
- Hazlitt, A MS. Addition to —'s *Essay on the Fear of Death* 45.
- Herbert, A Borrower from Quarles and — 50.
- Hippolyte, see Phèdre.
- Hobhouse, see Moore.
- Hofmannsthal 321; see also George.
- Holmes of the Breakfast-table 400.
- Hopkins, Charles, A Note on — (c. 1671-1700) 191.
- Howard, Sir Robert, The Marriages of — 410.
- Hugo, *Favras* and —'s *Marie Tudor* 24.
- Huntington Library, Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the — — 322.
- Iconology, see Renaissance.
- Illinois, Tales and Songs of Southern — 402.
- Ireland, William, The Fourth Forger. — and the Shakespeare Papers 456.
- Italian Etymological Notes 79.
- Italian Influence in France: Un Recueil italianisant du 18^e siècle français 528.
- Italian Poetry: Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo 626.
- Jean Renart, Counter-Notes on — 8.
- Johnsonian Gleanings: Part IX, a Further Miscellany 479.
- Jonson, Ben
- (A Concise Bibliography) 238; Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of — 310; An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy: J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of — 170.

- Joubert, Arnold, Shelley, and — 201.
 Judaeo-French, The Plural Usage in — 532.
- Keats, John**, The Poetical Works of — 546.
- Keller, The Conclusion of —'s *Grüner Heinrich* 285.
- Kennings: Die altenglischen Kennningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung 73.
- King of Tars*, Trivet's Constance and the — — — 354.
- Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry 560.
- Klein, Anton von, see Schiller.
- Kleist
 Die *Berliner Abendblätter* Heinrich von —, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion 301; A "Falsified Verse" in —'s *Homburg*? 505.
- Kyd: Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy* 456.
- La Fontaine**, Is *la Coupe enchantée* by — or Champmeslé? 105.
- Larpernt Plays, Catalogue of the — in the Huntington Library 322.
- Lawman, The English River-Names in —'s *Brut* 373.
- Layamon, see Lawman.
- Lazarillo de Tormes*, A Note on the — 130.
- Lazarus, Emma, Letters to — in the Columbia University Library 561.
- Leblanc, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé — sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de Voltaire 503.
- Lenz, Rodolfo, Homenaje a la memoria del Dr — 156.
- Leopardi, A Note on —'s *Bruto Minore* 524.
- Lessing's Dramatic Theory: Being an Introduction to and Commentary on his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* 630.
- Lichtenbergs Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte und sein Gesamtwerk 123.
- Lingua Nostra* 469.
- Lipsius, Iustus, Two Bookes of Constance Written in Latine by —. Englished by Sir John Stradling 475.
- Lloyd, Elizabeth — and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559.
- Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep and Goose* and Huntington MS. HM 144 563.
- Lyndsay, Sir David —, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland 240.
- Machiavelli**, The Date of —'s *Man-dragola* 526.
- manque (le) d'argent qui se fait rare* 332.
- Marlowe, The English *Faust Book* and the Date of —'s *Faustus* 95.
- Marot au Châtelet 1.
- Massinger: The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach 77.
- Medieval Number Symbolism 78.
- Meistersingerschule*, Was there a — at Danzig? 280.
- Melon, see Rousseau, J.-J.
- Melville in the South Seas 318.
- Memoirs of Captain Carleton*, see Defoe.
- Meredith, George — and his German Critics 553.
- Merville et T. Sauvage, *Favras*, see Hugo.
- Middle English
 A Manual of the Writings in — — 78; Three Textual Notes on 14th Century Poetry 379.
- Middle English Lyrics
 A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys" 249; Notes on — — — 243; Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century 308.
- Middle High German: *Vrasmunt*. Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte. Beilage: Das Mainzer Friedgebot vom Jahre 1300 545.
- Mildmay, References to the Drama in the — Diary 589.
- Milton
 — and Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* 183; — on himself 215; The —ic Setting, Past and Present 215; —'s English Again 591; —'s Use of Wollebe and Ames 403; The Date of —'s *Proposals for a Firme Government* 407; De Comus à Satan, l'œuvre poétique de — expliquée par sa vie 635; The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635; Shelley and — 585; A Study of —'s Christian Doctrine 212.
- Molière
 A Possible Source of a *Jeu de Scène* in —'s *Ecole des maris*

- 453; *The Relation of — to Restoration Comedy* 77.
 Montchrestien, Antoine de, *Aman*, a Critical Edition 555.
 Moore to Hobhouse: an Unpublished Letter 42.
 Motherwell, The Source of —'s *Me-lancholye* 296.
 Motion Pictures, see Cinema.
 Moxon, Edward —, Publisher of Poets 307.
 Neal, John, American Writers: a Series of Papers Contributed to *Blackwood's Magazine* (1824-1825) by — 319.
 Neale, Thomas, *The Warde* 455.
 North Briton (*The*), a Study in Political Propaganda 302.
 Number Symbolism, Medieval — 78.
 Old English: Case-Forms in -i in the Oldest English Texts 136.
 Old-English Charms, Notes on the — 139.
 Old French: Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature 557.
 Old Icelandic, On Six — — Words 596.
 Owen, Rebekah — and Thomas Hardy 316.
 Paine, Thomas, Six New Letters of — 400.
 Pater, Walter, *Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di —* 232.
 Pathelin, 1519-1522 106.
 Petty, Sir William, see Rousseau, J.-J.
 Phèdre, Le Thème de — et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française 76.
 Physiologus, The Icelandic —. Facsimile Edition with an Introduction 541.
 Poetry: Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung. System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft, I: Werk und Dichter 65.
 Pope, Mildred K., Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature. Presented to Professor — 557.
 Prior, Matthew —, Poet and Diplomatist 548.
 Quarles, A Borrower from — and Herbert 50.
 Racine, Jean 554.
 Rambervillers, Alphonse de —, Ligueur 442.
 Renaissance, Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the — 478.
 Renart, see Jean Renart.
 Restoration Comedy, see English Drama.
 Rilke 321.
 Romances, Galloway and the — 363.
 Ronsard 579.
 Rossetti's *Sister Helen* 238.
 Rousseau, J. B., An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy: — as an Imitator of Ben Jonson 170.
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques
 —, Melon, and Sir William Petty 499; — and Faust 581; — et les réformateurs du théâtre 161; — Hero-Worship: an Unpublished Intimate Record of 1766 449; The Basis of —'s Contemporaneous Reputation in England 270.
 Sauvage, T., see Merville.
 Schiller, Ein Brief —s an Anton von Klein 441.
Sege of Troye, a Study 242.
 Sercambi, see Chaucer.
 Shakespeare
 — 456; — Criticism. An Essay in Synthesis 456; — Persönliches aus Welt und Werk 456; — Quartos in Collotype Facsimile: *King Lear*, 1608; *The Merchant of Venice*, 1600; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602 632; — Studies. *Macbeth* 456; —'s Attitude towards the Catholic Church in *King John* 455; The Art and Life of — 534; A Census of —'s Plays in Quarto 1594-1709 226; Comical Satyre and —'s *Troilus and Cressida* 71; Copyhold Tenure and *Macbeth*, III, ii, 38 483; The Fourth Forger. William Ireland and the — Papers 456; *House and Slaves in King Lear* 594; The Jacobean — and *Measure for Measure* 456; Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus 103; *Julius Caesar* 145; *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, iii, 285-362 102; *Macbeth* 145; *The Passionate Pilgrim* 462; Poetic Alliteration 388; Prolegomena for the Oxford —: a Study in Editorial Method 150;

- The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet* 382; Die Sprache —s in Vers und Prosa 456; Theobald's Alleged — MS. 108.
- Shelley
— and Milton 585; Arnold, —, and Joubert 201; Parallels to Some Passages in *Prometheus Unbound* 428.
- Sidney, Das Bild Sir Philip —s in der englischen Renaissance 456.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, see *Gawain*.
- Slang, The Literature of — 473.
- "Song (A) of the Five Joys" 249.
- Spenser
"Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo" 418; Three Imitations of — 431.
- Steele
Contemporary Allusions in *The Tatler* 292; Goldsmith and —'s *Englishman* 294.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis 197.
- Stradling, Sir John, see Lipsius, Iustus.
- Stylistics
Die altenglischen Kenningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung 73; Rassisch-nationale Stilkunde 16; Le Style "circulaire" 495.
- Taylor, William — of Norwich and *Beowulf* 210.
- Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare MS. 108.
- Trivet's Constance and the *King of Tars* 354.
- Trollope's *Autobiography*, E. S. Dallas in — — 422.
- Udall, Nicholas —'s *Roister Doister* 476.
- Valentine and Orson* 242.
- Vauvenargues, Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de — 312.
- Vigny
Rassisch-nationale Stilkunde [*le Cor*] 16; Three Sources of —'s *Journal* 583.
- Voltaire, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de — 503.
- Vrasmunt*, Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte 545.
- Watson, Henry (trans.), *Valentine and Orson* 242.
- Whittier, Elizabeth Lloyd and the —s, a Budget of Letters 559.
- Widsith, The Myrkingas of — 141.
- Wieland, Haller and — 110.
- Wildenbruch, *Siegfrieds Blut*: Rassisch-nationale Stilkunde 16.
- William of Wadington, *le Manuel des Pechiez*: A 14th Century Scribe 601.
- Winckelmann 82.
- Wolfe, see Milton.
- Wordsworth
— and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper 466; — and the Pathetic Fallacy 187; The Letters of William and Dorothy —: the Later Years 464.
- Wulfila: über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas 154.
- Young, The Dating of —'s *Night-Thoughts* 194.
- Zola, Translations of — in the U. S. prior to 1900 520.

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Adams, J. Q. (ed.), *The Passionate Pilgrim* 462.
- Adams, N. B. and Salley, W. C., A Note on the Sources of *Venganza catalana* 454.
- Allen, R. J., Contemporary Allusions in *The Tatler* 292.
- Anderson, C. R., Melville in the South Seas 318.
- Armstrong, E. C., OFr. *Chaufrein* and OFr.-MFr. *Chanfrein* 134.
- Atkins, S., *Urfaust* L. 309 201.
- Atkinson, D. F., Some Further Chaucer Allusions 361.
- Baird, J. R., Milton and Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* 183.
- Baker, C., A Note on Shelley and Milton 585.
- Baker, E. A., The History of the English Novel 552; see also Peter, G. B.
- Baldensperger, F., Un Sonnet de William Drummond et son point

- de départ dans *la Semaine* de Du Bartas 493.
- Ball, R. H., *The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach* 77.
- Bandy, W. T., *A Self-Estimate by Baudelaire* 297; see also 482.
- Bang, C. K., *Haller and Wieland* 110.
- Barker, R. H., *Mr Cibber of Drury Lane* 641.
- Bartlett, H. C. and Pollard, A. W., *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709* 226.
- Battaglia, S. (ed.), *Boccaccio, Il Filocolo* 69.
- Bazell, C. E., *Case-Forms in -i in the Oldest English Texts* 136.
- Beall, C. B., *Un Recueil italienisant du 18^e siècle français* 528.
- Beare, M., *The German Popular Play *Atis* and the Venetian Opera* 640.
- Bell, C. H., *Was there a Meistersingerschule at Danzig?* 280.
- Bennett, J. W., *Churchyard's Description of the Queen's Entertainment at Woodstock in 1592* 391.
- Bernard, J. E., Jr., *The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude* 455.
- Bernbaum, E., *Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800* 54.
- Bird, C. W., *Three Sources of Vi-gny's Journal* 583.
- Black, M. W. (ed.), *Elizabethan and 17th Century Lyrics* 239.
- Blair, L., *A Note on the Relation of the Corpus Christi Procession to the Corpus Christi Play in England* 83.
- Blair, T. M. H. (ed.), *Banks, The Unhappy Favourite* 221.
- Blenner-Hassett, R., *The English River-Names in Lawman's Brut* 373.
- Boehringer, R. (ed.), *Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal* 67.
- Boeschstein, H., see Lange, V.
- Bonno, G., *Un Texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les Lettres philosophiques de Voltaire* 503.
- Booth, B. A. (ed.), *Galt, The Gathering of the West* 316; *Moore to Hobhouse: an Unpublished Letter* 42.
- Borish, M. E., *A Second Version of John Day's Peregrinatio Scholastica* 35.
- Bowers, F. T., *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* 536.
- Bowers, R. H. (ed.), *The Gast of Gy* 642; *The Text of Grobiana's Nuptials* 109.
- Boyce, B., *Tom Brown of Facetious Memory* 234.
- Branca, V. (ed.), *Boccaccio, Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di Diana* 69.
- Braunlich, A. F., *Parallels to Some Passages in Prometheus Unbound* 428.
- Brooks, R. A. E. (ed.), *Carlyle, Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858* 638.
- Broughton, L. N., see Serjeantson, M. S.
- Brown, C. (ed.), *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century* 308.
- Brown, C. S., Jr. and West, R. H., "As by the whelp chastised is the leon" 209; see also 481.
- Bühler, C. F., *Lydgate's Horse, Sheep and Goose and Huntington MS. HM 144* 563.
- Burke, W. J., *The Literature of Slang. With an Introductory Note by E. Partridge* 473.
- Cadwalader, J., *Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare MS.* 108.
- Caldwell, R. A., *Chaucer's Taillynge Ynough, Canterbury Tales, B² 1624* 262.
- Campbell, A. (ed.), *The Battle of Brunanburh* 74.
- Campbell, M. E., *Defoe's First Poem* 314.
- Campbell, O. J., *Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida* 71.
- Carlson, C. L., *The First Magazine, a History of The Gentleman's Magazine* 305.
- Chambers, E. K., *Coleridge* 227.
- Chambers, R. W., *The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure* 456.
- Cioranescu, Al., *Alphonse de Rambervillers, Ligueur* 442.
- Clark, A. F. B., *Jean Racine* 554.
- Clark, H. H. (ed.), *Six New Letters of Thomas Paine* 400.
- Clarkson, P. S. and Warren, C. T., *Copyhold Tenure and Macbeth, III, ii, 38* 483.
- Coles, B., *Shakespeare Studies. Macbeth* 456.

- Colimore, F.-D., The Date of Machiavelli's *Mandragola* 526.
- Cooley, F., William Taylor of Norwich and *Beowulf* 216.
- Crosby, H. L., Jr., Two Notes on *Beowulf* 605.
- Currier, T. F. (ed.), Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559.
- De Selincourt, E. (ed.), The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth 464.
- Di Benedetto, L. (ed.), Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo 626.
- Dickson, A. (ed.), Henry Watson (trans.), *Valentine and Orson* 242.
- Diekhoff, J. S., Milton on himself 215.
- Eastman, C. W., Goethe's *An den Mond* 509.
- Estrich, R. M., A Possible Provençal Source for Chaucer's *House of Fame*, 300-310 342.
- Everett, E. M., The Party of Humanity, *The Fortnightly Review* and its Contributors, 1865-1874 302.
- Eves, C. K., Matthew Prior 548.
- Fenimore, E., A Monetary Question in *Gautier d'Aupais*? 338; see also 561.
- Ferguson, D., Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759-1796 229.
- Fink, Z. S., The Date of Milton's *Proposals for a Firme Government* 407.
- Fitch, G. B., *Favras* and Hugo's *Marie Tudor* 24.
- Fox, B., Revision in Browning's *Paracelsus* 195.
- Françon, M., Marot au Châtelet 1.
- Frank, G., *As by the Whelp Chastised is the Leon* 481.
- Franz, W., Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa 456.
- Friedman, A., Goldsmith and Steele's *Englishman* 294.
- Furst, N., The Conclusion of Keller's *Grüner Heinrich* 285.
- Gallacher, S. A., *Einem den Hahnenfuss unterbreiten* 366.
- Garrod, H. W. (ed.), The Poetical Works of John Keats 546.
- Gerstner, H. and Schworm, K. (eds.), *Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit* 628.
- Gilbert, A. H., Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus 103.
- Gillet, J. E., A Note on the *Lazarillo de Tormes* 130.
- Green, H. J. (ed.), *Ansej's de Mes* 624.
- Greenewald, G. M., Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in *King John* 455.
- Greg, W. W. (ed.), Shakespeare Quartos in ColloTYPE Facsimile 632.
- Grégoire, A., Edmond — Puxi — Michel, les Prénoms de trois enfants 621.
- Griffin, N. E. (ed.), Guido de Columnis, *Historia Destructionis Troiae* 78.
- Griggs, E. L. (ed.), Wordsworth and Coleridge 466.
- Grubbs, H. A., An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy: J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of Ben Jonson 170.
- Guérard, A., Jr., The Dates of Some of Robert Bridges' Lyrics 199.
- Guinagh, K., Source of the Quotation from Augustine in *The Parson's Tale*, 985 211.
- Hall, C. M., see Kirk, R.
- Hanson, L., The Life of S. T. Coleridge 466.
- Harper, G. L., see Subjects.
- Harrington, K. P., Richard Alsop, "A Hartford Wit" 319.
- Hatcher, A. G., The Rise and Fall of *s'écrier* in French 323.
- Haust, Jean, see Subjects.
- Havens, G. R., The Dates of Diderot's Birth and Death 31; Rousseau, Melon, and Sir William Petty 499.
- Henkin, L. J., Jacob and the Hooly Jew 254.
- Hermannsson, H. (ed.), The Icelandic *Physiologus* 541.
- Hofstrand, G., *The Seege of Troye*, a Study 242.
- Holmes, U. T., Jr., *Pathelin*, 1519-1522 106.
- Hook, J. N., Three Imitations of Spenser 431.
- Hooker, E. N. (ed.), The Critical Works of John Dennis 315.
- Hopper, V. F., Medieval Number Symbolism 78.

- Hornstein, L. H., Trivet's Constance and the *King of Tars* 354.
- Houghton, W. E., Jr., The Formation of Thomas Fuller's "Holy and Profane States" 147.
- Howe, M. A. D., Holmes of the Breakfast-table 400.
- Hutton, J., Three Notes on French Authors: Desportes, Guérout, Ronsard 579.
- Irvine, W., Walter Bagehot 636.
- Jones, A. E., A Note on Charles Hopkins (c. 1671-1700) 191.
- Jones, M. B., Translations of Zola in the U. S. prior to 1900 520.
- Kellermann, W., Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman 222.
- Kirk, R. and Hall, C. M. (eds.), Two Bookes of Constance Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius 475.
- Kirschbaum, L., The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet* 382.
- Kittredge, G. L. (ed.), Shakespeare, *Macbeth*; *Julius Caesar* 145.
- Kleineke, W., Englische Fürstenspiegel vom *Polieraticus* Johannis von Salisbury bis zum *Basilikon Doron* König Jakobs I. 241.
- Kleinschmidt, J. R., The Date of the *Cid* in English 575.
- Knickerbocker, W. S., Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert 201.
- Kocher, P. H., The English *Faust Book* and the Date of Marlowe's *Faustus* 95.
- Koenig, V. F., Counter-Notes on Jean Renart 8.
- Krakeur, L. G., La Correspondance de Diderot 472.
- Kuhl, E. P., Chaucer's Monk 480.
- Kunstmann, J. G., Chaucer's Archangel 259.
- Kurrelmeyer, W., Ein Brief Schillers an Anton von Klein 441; Vier Briefe aus Gleims Freundeskreise 433.
- Laird, C., A 14th Century Scribe 601.
- Lancaster, H. C., Is *la Coupe enchantée* by La Fontaine or Champmeslé? 105.
- Lange, V. and Boeschenstein, H., Kulturkritik und Literaturbeachtung in Amerika 152.
- Las Vergnas, R., Joseph Conrad 316.
- Lenz, R., see Subjects.
- Levy, R., Is *Gautier d'Aupais* a Typical "Poème Courtois"? 561; The Plural Usage in Judaeo-French 532.
- Lewis, C. S., Rehabilitations and Other Essays 235; see also Tillyard, E. M. W.
- Livingston, C. H., English *Funk* 265.
- Löhmman, O., Die Sage von *Gawain und dem grünen Ritter* 159.
- Logan, J. V., Wordsworth and the Pathetic Fallacy 187.
- Lumiansky, R. M., Milton's English Again 591.
- McGing, M. E., A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in Byron's *Don Juan* 39.
- McIlwraith, A. K. (ed.), Five Elizabethan Tragedies 456.
- McKenzie, G., Organic Unity in Coleridge 227.
- McKerrow, R. B., Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare 150.
- MacMillan, D., Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library 322; Some Notes on 18th Century Essex Plays 176.
- McPeck, J. A. S., Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639.
- Magoun, F. P., Jr., On Six Old-Icelandic Words 596.
- Mair, J., The Fourth Forger 456.
- Malakis, E., Baudelaire and Bandy 482.
- Malone, K., The Myrtingas of *Widsith* 141.
- Manly, J. M. and Rickert, E. (eds.), The Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 606.
- Marquardt, H., Die altenglischen Kenningar 73.
- Marv Immaculate, Sister, A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys" 249.
- Mautner, F. H., Lichtenbergs Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte und sein Gesamtwerk 123.
- Maxwell, B., S. A. Tannenbaum, Bibliographies 160.
- Menner, R. J., Notes on M. E. Lyrics 243.
- Menon, C. N., Shakespeare Criticism 456.
- Merriam, H. G., Edward Moxon, Publisher of Poets 307.

- Metcalf, G. J., Forms of Address in German (1500-1800) 298.
 Mitchell, J. A. (ed.), Neale, *The Warde* 455.
 Moley, R., Are We Movie Made? 322.
 Monnet, C. (trans.), F. Olivero (ed.), *Beowulf* 241.
 Moore, J. R., Evidence for Defoe's Authorship of *The Memoirs of Captain Carleton* 430.
 Morand, P. P., De Comus à Satan 635; The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635.
 Mossner, E. C., Rousseau Hero-Worship 449.
 Murison, W., Sir David Lyndsay 240.
 Neely, C. (collector) and Spargo, J. W. (ed.), Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois 402.
 Newton, W., Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française 76.
 Nobbe, G., *The North Briton*, a Study in Political Propaganda 302.
 Norman, H. L., A Note on Leopardi's *Bruto Minore* 524.
 Ogilvy, J. D. A., Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Alcuin to Alcuin 240.
 Olivero, F. (ed.), *Beowulf* 241; Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater 232.
 Panofsky, E., Studies in Iconology 478.
 Parker, J. H., A Possible Source of a *Jeu de Scène* in Molière's *Ecole des maris* 453.
 Parry, J. J. (ed. and trans.), *Brut y Brenhinedd* 160.
 Partridge, E., see Burke, W. J.
 Pattee, F. L. (ed.), J. Neal, American Writers 319.
 Perry, H. Ten E., Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes 641.
 Petersen, J., Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung 65.
 Petter, G. B., George Meredith and his German Critics. With a preface by E. A. Baker 553.
 Pettit, H., The Dating of Young's *Night-Thoughts* 194.
 Peyre, H., Hommes et œuvres du XX^e siècle 158.
 Pollard, A. W., see Bartlett, H. C.
 Pope, M. K., see Subjects.
 Potter, G. R., Donne's *Paradoxes* in 1707 53.
 Pratt, R. A., Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale* and Sercambi 142.
 Privitera, J. F., The Date of Mme Deshoulières's Parody of *le Cid* 451.
 Raith, J., Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters *Palace of Pleasure* 241.
 Ralph, P. L., References to the Drama in the Mildmay Diary 589.
 Reade, A. L., Johnsonian Gleanings 479.
 Reese, H., A Borrower from Quarles and Herbert 50.
 Reynolds, G. F., The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625 540.
 Richardson, L. C., A Note on *Chest* 378.
 Rickert, E., see Manly, J. M.
 Robertson, J. G., Lessing's Dramatic Theory 630.
 Roellinger, F. X., E. S. Dallas in Trollope's *Autobiography* 422.
 Romera-Navarro, M. (ed.), Gracián, *El Criticón* 556.
 Rooth, E., *Vrasmunt* 545.
 Rosenfeld, M.-V., Chaucer and the Liturgy 357.
 Rusk, R. L. (ed.), The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson 231; Letters to Emma Lazarus 561.
 Salley, W. C., see Adams, N. B.
 Savage, H., Arcite's Maying 207; A Note on *Sir Gawain* 1795 604.
 Scheurweghs, G. (ed.), Nicholas Udall's *Roister Doister* 476.
 Schinz, A. (ed.), 19th Century French Readings 320.
 Schneider, H., Der Drucker des *Hessischen Landboten* 512.
 Schücking, L. L., The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero 456; Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy* 456.
 Schworm, K., see Gerstner, H.
 Scott, F. R., The Marriages of Sir Robert Howard 410.
 Scott-Craig, T. S. K., Milton's Use of Wolleb and Ames 403.

- Secord, A. W. (ed.), Defoe's *Review* 218.
- Seiver, G. O. (ed.), Montchrestien, *Aman* 555.
- Selincourt, E. de, see De Selincourt.
- Sembdner, H., Die *Berliner Abendblätter* Heinrich von Kleists, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion 301.
- Serjeantson, M. S. and Broughton, L. N., Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature 239.
- Sewell, A., A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine 212.
- Shields, A. K., García Gutiérrez's Birth-Date 296.
- Shook, L. K., Notes on the Old-English Charms 139.
- Shudofsky, M. M., *The Gentleman-Cully* 396.
- Siebeck, B., Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance 456.
- Silz, W., A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's *Homburg*? 505.
- Simison, B. D., The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Addenda 425.
- Singer, A. E., Flaubert's *Une Nuit de Don Juan* 516.
- Sledd, J., *Hause and Slaves in King Lear* 594; Three Textual Notes on 14th Century Poetry 379.
- Sloane, W., Some Plagiarisms in 17th Century Books of Advice to Children 416.
- Snyder, E. D., A Note on R. L. S. 197.
- Sommerfeld, M. (ed.), George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke 321.
- Spargo, J. W., see Neely, C.
- Spencer, H., The Art and Life of William Shakespeare 534.
- Spencer, T. and Van Doren, M., Studies in Metaphysical Poetry 456.
- Spitzer, L., A. Fr. *Escharevotée 'Ecorchée'* 447; *Le manque d'argent qui se fait rare* 332; Rassisch-nationale Stilkunde 16; Robert A. Hall, Jr., "Italian Etymological Notes" 79; Le Style "circulaire" 495.
- Stauffer, D. A., A Parasitical Form of Biography 289.
- Stevenson, N. W., Paris dans la *Comédie humaine* de Balzac 157.
- Stoll, E. E., Modesty in the Audience 570; Poetic Alliteration 388.
- Stone, G. W., Jr. (ed.), The Journal of David Garrick 560.
- Sturtevant, A. M., Gothic *pis* 599.
- Sypherd, W. O., The Literature of the English Bible 237.
- Tannenbaum, S. A., Ben Jonson 238; Bibliographies 160.
- Tatlock, J. S. P., Chaucer's Monk 350; see also 480.
- Taylor, A., Problems in German Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries 543.
- Thomas, S., "Hobgoblin Runne Away with the Garland from Apollo" 418.
- Tillyard, E. M. W., The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present 215; — and Lewis, C. S., The Personal Heresy, a Controversy 233.
- Troxell, J. C. (ed.), Rossetti's *Sister Helen* 238.
- Tupper, F. S., Colley and Caius Ciber 393.
- Üçök, N., über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas 154.
- Van Doren, M., Shakespeare 456; see also Spencer, T.
- Vial, F., Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, marquis de Vauvenargues 312.
- Von der Mühl, E., Rousseau et les réformateurs du théâtre 161.
- Walten, M. G. (ed.), Thomas Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State* 147.
- Walz, J. A., *Hexenfezen. Faust II*, L. 6199 117.
- Warner, J. H., The Basis of J.-J. Rousseau's Contemporaneous Reputation in England 270.
- Warren, C. T., see Clarkson, P. S.
- Wasserman, E. R., Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments" 432; The Source of Motherwell's *Melancholye* 296.
- Weber, C. J., Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy 316.
- Webster, K. G. T., Galloway and the Romances 363.
- Wecter, D., Burke's Error Regarding Sugar-Crystals 47; Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen 307.

- Wells, H. W., Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights 456.
 Wells, J. E., A Manual of the Writings in M. E. 78.
 Wells, S. B., *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv, iii, 285-362 102.
 West, R. H., The Invisible World 455; see also Brown, C. S., Jr.
 Weygandt, A. M., Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry 560.
 Wheeler, C. F., Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson 310.
 Whitbread, L., Four Text-Notes on *Deor* 204.
 Wilcox, J., The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy 77.
 Wilcox, S. C., A MS. Addition to Hazlitt's *Essay on the Fear of Death* 45.
 Winters, Y., Primitivism and Decadence 152.
 Wollenberg, R., Shakespeare Persönliches aus Welt und Werk 456.
 Woodbridge, B. M., Rousseau and Faust 581.
 Wright, L. H., American Fiction 1774-1850 400.
 Young, L. M., Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History 550.

REVIEWERS

- Abbott, W. C., L. M. Young, Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History 550.
 Allen, D. C.: R. Kirk and C. M. Hall (eds.), Two Bookes of Constance Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius 475.
 Bald, R. C.: E. L. Griggs (ed.), Wordsworth and Coleridge 466; L. Hanson, The Life of S. T. Coleridge 466.
 Baldwin, T. W.: J. E. Bernard, Jr., The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude 455; R. W. Chambers, The Jacobean Shakespeare and *Measure for Measure* 456; B. Coles, Shakespeare Studies. *Macbeth* 456; W. Franz, Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa 456; G. M. Greenewald, Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in *King John* 455; A. K. McIlwraith (ed.), Five Elizabethan Tragedies 456; J. Mair, The Fourth Forger 456; C. N. Menon, Shakespeare Criticism 456; J. A. Mitchell (ed.), Neale, *The Warde* 455; L. L. Schücking, The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero 456; L. L. Schücking, Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy* 456; B. Siebeck, Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance 456; T. Spencer and M. Van Doren, Studies in Metaphysical Poetry 456; M. Van Doren, Shakespeare 456; H. W. Wells, Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights 456; R. H. West, The Invisible World 455; R. Wollenberg, Shakespeare Persönliches aus Welt und Werk 456.
 Baum, P. F.: J. C. Troxell (ed.), Rossetti's *Sister Helen* 238.
 Beach, J. W.: B. A. Booth (ed.), Galt, *The Gathering of the West* 316; R. Las Vergnas, Joseph Conrad 316; C. J. Weber, Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy 316.
 Blankenagel, J. C.: H. Sembdner, Die *Berliner Abendblätter* Heinrich von Kleists, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion 301.
 Boas, G.: E. M. W. Tillyard and C. S. Lewis, The Personal Heresy, a Controversy 233.
 Bowers, R. H.: G. Scheurweghs (ed.), Nicholas Udall's *Roister Doister* 476.
 Bredvold, L. I.: E. N. Hooker (ed.), The Critical Works of John Dennis 315.
 Brooke, T.: O. J. Campbell, Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* 71.
 Brown, C.: J. M. Manly and E. Rickert (eds.), The Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 606.
 Burgum, E. B.: W. Irvine, Walter Bagehot 636.
 Cowie, A.: K. P. Harrington, Richard Alsop, "A Hartford Wit" 319.
 Dawson, G. E.: H. C. Bartlett and A. W. Pollard, A Census of Shake-

- speare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709 226.
- Day, C. L.: B. Boyce, Tom Brown of Facetious Memory 234.
- Dieckmann, H.: L. G. Krakeur, La Correspondance de Diderot 472.
- Eccles, M.: S. A. Tannenbaum, Ben Jonson 238.
- Edgar, P.: E. A. Baker, The History of the English Novel 552.
- Feise, E.: R. Boehringer (ed.), Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal 67.
- Fitzhugh, R. T.: D. Ferguson, Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759-1796 229.
- Flom, G. T.: H. Hermannsson (ed.), The Icelandic *Physiologus* 541.
- Foerster, N.: R. L. Rusk (ed.), The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson 231.
- Frank, G.: Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature 557.
- Gilbert, A. H.: A. Sewell, A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine 212.
- Graham, W.: E. M. Everett, The Party of Humanity 302; G. Nobbe, *The North Briton* 302.
- Greene, R. L.: C. Brown (ed.), Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century 308.
- Greg, W. W.: J. Q. Adams (ed.), *The Passionate Pilgrim* 462.
- Hard, F.: R. L. Rusk (ed.), Letters to Emma Lazarus 561.
- Havens, R. D.: M. W. Black (ed.), Elizabethan and 17th Century Lyrics 239; E. de Selincourt (ed.), The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth 464; M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton, Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature 239.
- Howard, L.: H. H. Clark (ed.), Six New Letters of Thomas Paine 400; M. A. D. Howe, Holmes of the Breakfast-table 400; L. H. Wright, American Fiction 1774-1850 400.
- Hughes, M. Y.: W. E. Houghton, Jr., The Formation of Thomas Fuller's "Holy and Profane States" 147; M. G. Walten (ed.), Thomas Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State* 147.
- Hulbert, J. R.: O. Löhmann, Die Sage von *Gawain und dem grünen Ritter* 159.
- Hutton, J.: J. A. S. McPeck, Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639.
- Jameson, R. D.: C. S. Lewis, Rehabilitations and Other Essays 235.
- Jarrell, H. M.: F. L. Pattee (ed.), J. Neal, American Writers 319.
- Johnson, B.: G. B. Petter, George Meredith and his German Critics 553.
- Jones, C. E.: C. R. Anderson, Melville in the South Seas 318.
- Kozumplik, W. A.: G. J. Metcalf, Forms of Address in German (1500-1800) 298.
- Kueth, J. L.: W. J. Burke, The Literature of Slang 473.
- Lancaster, H. C.: A. F. B. Clark, Jean Racine 554; W. Newton, Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française 76; G. O. Seiver (ed.), Montchrestien, *Aman* 555.
- Lemmi, C. W.: C. F. Wheeler, Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson 310.
- Lüdeke, H.: V. Lange and H. Boeschstein, Kulturkritik und Literaturbetrachtung in Amerika 152; Y. Winters, Primitivism and Decadence 152.
- Lynes, C., Jr.: N. W. Stevenson, Paris dans la *Comédie humaine* de Balzac 157.
- McCutcheon, R. P.: C. L. Carlson, The First Magazine 305.
- McElderry, B. R., Jr.: H. G. Merriam, Edward Moxon 307; D. Wecter, Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen 307.
- McKillop, A. D.: A. W. Secord (ed.), Defoe's *Review* 218.
- McManaway, J. G.: W. W. Greg (ed.), Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile 632.
- MacMillan, D.: G. W. Stone, Jr. (ed.), The Journal of David Garrick 560.

- Malakis, E.: A. Schinz (ed.), 19th Century French Readings 320.
- Malone, K.: R. H. Bowers (ed.), *The Gast of Gy* 642; A. Campbell (ed.), *The Battle of Brunanburh* 74; A. Dickson (ed.), Henry Watson (trans.), *Valentine and Orson* 242; N. E. Griffin (ed.), Guido de Columnis, *Historia Destructionis Troiae* 78; G. Hofstrand, *The Seege of Troye*, a Study 242; V. F. Hopper, Medieval Number Symbolism 78; W. Kleineke, Englische Fürstenspiegel vom *Policraticus* Johannis von Salisbury bis zum *Basilikon Doron* König Jakobs I. 241; H. Marquardt, Die altenglischen Kenningar 73; C. Monnet (trans.), F. Olivero (ed.), *Beowulf* 241; W. Murison, Sir David Lyndsay 240; C. Neely (collector) and J. W. Spargo (ed.), Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois 402; J. D. A. Ogilvy, Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin 240; J. J. Parry (ed. and trans.), *Brut y Brenhinedd* 160; J. Raith, Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters *Palace of Pleasure* 241; J. E. Wells, A Manual of the Writings in M. E. 78.
- Miller, E. E.: H. Gerstner and K. Schworm (eds.), Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit 628.
- Morley, S. G.: M. Romera-Navarro (ed.), Gracián, *El Criticón* 556.
- Morrisette, B. A.: F. Vial, Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, marquis de Vauvenargues 312.
- Muller, H. F.: A. Grégoire, Edmond — Puxi — Michel, les Prenoms de trois enfants 621.
- Nethercot, A. H.: T. M. H. Blair (ed.), Banks, *The Unhappy Favourite* 221.
- Nicoll, A.: D. MacMillan, Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library 322; R. Mooley, Are We Movie Made? 322.
- O'Brien, J.: H. Peyre, Hommes et œuvres du XX^e siècle 158.
- Parker, W. R.: J. S. Diekhoff (ed.), Milton on himself 215; E. M. W. Tillyard, The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present 215.
- Paulsen, W.: M. Beare, The German Popular Play *Atis* and the Venetian Opera 640; M. Sommerfeld (ed.), George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke 321.
- Porterfield, A. W.: N. Üçok, Über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas 154.
- Pottle, F. A.: A. L. Reade, John-sonian Gleanings 479.
- Rollins, H. E.: R. B. McKerrow, Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare 150.
- Rosenau, W.: W. O. Sypherd, The Literature of the English Bible 237.
- Roulston, R. B.: J. G. Robertson, Lessing's Dramatic Theory 630.
- Secord, A. W.: M. E. Campbell, De-foe's First Poem 314.
- Selmer, C.: E. Rooth, *Vrasmunt* 545; A. Taylor, Problems in German Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries 543.
- Shine, H.: R. A. E. Brooks (ed.), Carlyle, *Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858* 638; A. M. Weygandt, Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry 560.
- Singleton, C. S.: S. Battaglia (ed.), Boccaccio, *Il Filocolo* 69; V. Branca (ed.), Boccaccio, *Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di Diana* 69; L. Di Benedetto (ed.), Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo 626; E. Panofsky, Studies in Iconology 478.
- Sisson, C. J.: G. L. Kittredge (ed.), Shakespeare, *Macbeth*; *Julius Caesar* 145; H. Spencer, The Art and Life of William Shakespeare 534.
- Snyder, A. D.: E. K. Chambers, Coleridge 227; G. McKenzie, Organic Unity in Coleridge 227.
- Spencer, H.: R. H. Ball, The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach 77; R. H. Barker, Mr Cibber of Drury Lane 641; F. T. Bowers, Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642 536; H. Ten E. Perry,

- Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes 641; G. F. Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625 540; J. Wilcox, The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy 77.
- Spitzer, L.: H. J. Green (ed.), *Ansej's de Mes* 624; Homenaje a la memoria del Dr Rodolfo Lenz 156; W. Kellermann, Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman 222; *Lingua Nostra* 469; *Mélanges de linguistique romane offerts à M. Jean Haust* 401.
- Stauffer, D. A.: F. Olivero, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater 232.
- Taylor, A.: J. Petersen, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung 65.
- Thorpe, C. DeW.: H. W. Garrod (ed.), The Poetical Works of John Keats 546.
- Tillyard, E. M. W.: P. P. Morand, De Comus à Satan 635; P. P. Morand, The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635.
- Williams, S. T.: T. F. Currier (ed.), Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559.
- Wright, H. B.: C. K. Eves, Matthew Prior 548.

L
—

al
M
A
br
Cl
or

N
\$1
es
at

R
Co

So
A
fo
U
[S
ac
M
th
m

(e
m
la
th
E
na
of
m

st
E
Pr

an
sp
L
fo
th
X

P
Jo
C
\$2

T
m
of
ex

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Annual bibliography of English language and literature. Vol. XIX, 1938.—Ed. for Modern Humanities Research Association, by A. Macdonald and L. N. Broughton. *Cambridge*: University Press [Chicago: U. of Chicago Press], 1940. Pp. xii + 284. \$2.25 or 8 sh. 6 d.

Bryant, Margaret M.—Essays old and new. *New York*: Crofts, 1940. Pp. xxviii + 417. \$1.75. [An attractive volume containing 71 essays, somewhat more than half of which are by living American or English writers.]

Bryant, Margaret M. and Aiken, Janet R.—Psychology of English. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 229. \$2.50.

Byron.—Poetry and prose, with essays by Scott, Hazlitt, Macaulay, etc. Ed. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and D. N. Smith. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. xiv + 207. \$1.25. [Snippets like these give no idea of Byron's achievement. Better have *Beppo* than Macaulay's essay, and one of the dramas than Scott's or Hazlitt's essays; above all more of *Don Juan*.]

Campbell, O. J., Gundy, J. V., Shrodes, C. (eds.)—Patterns for living. *New York*: Macmillan, 1940. Pp. xxii + 1306. \$2.75. [A large, attractively printed, stimulating anthology designed "for college students of English as a foundation for a closely coordinated course in reading and writing"; most of the selections are contemporary or modern.]

Cawley, Robert R.—Unpathed waters, studies in the influence of the voyagers on Elizabethan literature. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 285. \$3.75.

Charlton, H. B.—'Romeo and Juliet' as an experimental tragedy. Annual Shakespeare lecture of the British Academy, 1939. *London*: Humphrey Milford [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. 45. \$0.85. (From the proceedings of the British Academy, XXV.)

Conrad, Joseph.—Letters to Marguerite Poradowska, 1890-1920. Transl. and ed. John A. Gee and Paul J. Sturm. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1940. Pp. xxvi + 147. \$2.75.

Craig, Hardin and Dodds, John W. (eds.)—Types of English fiction. *New York*: Macmillan, 1940. Pp. xii + 745. \$1.50. (Types of English Literature.) [Short stories and extracts from novels by thirty-three English

writers, from Mandeville to Virginia Woolf, introductions and short bibliographies.]

Craigie, William A.—The growth of American English, I. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. 25. \$0.75. [S. P. E. Tract, lvi.]

Eigerman, Hyman (ed.)—The poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 114. \$2.00.

French, Walter H.—Essays on *King Horn*. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 204. \$2.50. (Cornell Studies in English, XXX.)

Haight, Gordon S.—George Eliot and John Chapman, with Chapman's diaries. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 261. \$2.75.

Harbage, Alfred.—Annals of English drama, 975-1700, an analytical record of all plays, extant or lost, chronologically arranged and indexed by authors, titles, dramatic companies, etc. *Philadelphia, Pa.*: U. of Pa. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 264. \$3.00.

Neff, Emery.—A revolution in European poetry, 1660-1900. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 279. \$3.00.

Nitchie, Elizabeth.—The Reverend Colonel Finch. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 109. \$1.50.

Partridge, Eric.—Slang. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. ii + 21. \$0.75. [S. P. E. Tract, lv.]

Payne, John H.—*The Last Duel in Spain*, and other plays. Ed. C. Hislop and W. R. Richardson. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 265. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, vol. vi.)

Phillips, James E., Jr.—The state in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman plays. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 230. \$2.75. (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 149.)

Robbins, Harry W. and Parker, Roscoe E.—Advanced composition. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1940. Pp. xx + 431. \$2.25. (Revised edition.)

Shelly, Percy Van Dyke.—The living Chaucer. *Philadelphia, Pa.*: U. of Pa. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 331. \$3.00.

Smart, Walter K.—English review grammar. Fourth edition. *New York*: Crofts, 1940. Pp. xii + 274. \$1.25.

Stoll, Elmer E.—Shakespeare and other masters. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard U. Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 430. \$4.50.

Temple, Sir William.—Three essays. With introduction and notes by F. J. Fielden. *London* [New York]: Oxford U. Press, Indian Branch, 1939. Pp. xxvi + 139. \$1.50. ["Of Poetry," "Of Popular Discontents," "Of Health and Long Life," with a brief

introduction, biographical table, list of T.'s works, and 21 pages of notes.]

Tengstrand, Erik.—A contribution to the study of genitival composition in Old English place-names. *Uppsala*: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1940. Pp. lxxviii + 354. (Nomina Germanica, 7.)

Tolles, Winton.—Tom Taylor and the Victorian drama. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 299. \$3.50. (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 148.)

Woodbridge, Homer E.—Sir William Temple, the man and his work. *New York*: Mod. Lang. Ass'n., 1940. Pp. xii + 361. (Monograph Series, xii.)

GERMAN

Bang, Carol Klee.—Maske und Gesicht in den Werken Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. [Hesperia, Studies in Germanic Philology, No. 20]. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. xii, 190 pp. \$2.50.

Closs, A., and Mainland, W. F.—German Lyrics of the Seventeenth Century. A Miscellany compiled and edited. *London*: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1940. xvii, 93 pp. 6 s.

Dornseiff, Franz.—Der deutsche Wortschatz nach Sachgruppen. Register. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1940. 58 pp. 4°. M. 1.60.

Ertle, Elisabeth.—Die Flurnamen der Gemeinden Hart, Hassmoning und Stein. Diss. Würzburg. [Die Flurnamen Bayerns. Reihe 1, 1, a]. *München*: Oldenbourg, 1939. vi, 52 pp. 4°. M. 2.80.

Failing, Adolf.—Die Familiennamen von Uelversheim in Rheinhessen. Diss. [Giesener Beiträge zur dt. Philologie. 72]. *Giessen*: von Münchow, 1939. 45 pp. M. 2.50.

Findeisen, Kurt Arnold.—Paul Fleming, der Dichter und Ostlandfahrer. [Schriftenreihe Grosse Sachsen, Diener des Reiches. Bd. 15]. *Dresden*: v. Baensch [1939]. 79 pp. M. 1.50.

Fleischmann, Kurt.—Theobald Höck und das sprachliche Frühbarock. *Reichenberg*: Kraus [1937]. 60 pp. M. 2.25.

Geibel, Emanuel.—Briefwechsel Emanuel Geibel und Karl Goedeke. (Hrsg. von Gustav Struck). [Veröffentlichungen der Bibliotheken der Hansestadt Lübeck. N. R. Bd. 1]. [Lübeck: Stadtbibl. 1939]. viii, 173 pp. M. 3.

Goethe. Begegnung mit —. Bericht über d. Arbeitswoche des "Köngener Kreises" in Königsfeld, vom 1. bis 6. Januar 1939. Im Auftrag d. Köngener hrsg. von Rudolf Daur. *Heilbronn*: Salzer, 1939. 130 pp. M. 2.

Goethes Briefwechsel mit Georg und Caroline Sartorius [v. Waltershausen] (von 1801-1825). Mit 15 neuen Goethe-Briefen und vielen anderen unbekannten Dokumenten aus der Goethezeit. Auf Veranlassung von Wilhelm Werner von Bobers im Auftr. des

Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs hrsg. u. bearb. von Else von Monroy. [Göttingen:] Vereinigung Göttinger Bücherfreunde e. V. 1931. xlii, 228 pp.

Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust. A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University Library Staff. Edited, arranged and supplied with literary notes and preceded by an Introduction and a biographical sketch of William A. Speck by Carl Frederick Schreiber. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1940. xlii, 239 pp., and plates. folio. \$10.00.

Hardenberg, Hans.—Die Fachsprache der bergischen Eisen- und Stahlwarenindustrie. Diss. Teildruck. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1939. 79 pp.

Hiller, Joseph Anthony.—Albrecht von Eyb Medieval Moralist. Dissertation. [Catholic Univ. of America Studies in German Vol. XIII]. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ. of America, 1939. xvi, 220 pp.

Hohfeld, A. R.—Zur Textgestaltung der neueren Fausta Ausgaben [S.-A. aus: Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht XXXII, No. 2]. *Madison*: 1940. Pp. 49-71.

—, **Joos, Martin, and Twaddell, W. F.**—Wortindex zu Goethes Faust. *Madison, Wis.*: Dept. of German, Univ. of Wisconsin, 1940. xiv, 161 pp. \$3.00.

Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts Frankfurt a. M. Im Auftr. d. Verwaltung hrsg. von Ernst Beutler. [Jg. 41]. 1936-40. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1940. 719 pp. M. 14.

Jürgens, Adolf.—Ergebnisse deutscher Wissenschaft. Eine bibliographische Auswahl aus der deutschen wissenschaftlichen Literatur der Jahre 1933-1938. *New York*: Veritas Press, 1939. xviii, 782 pp.

Kaufmann, F. W.—German Dramatists of the 19th Century. *Los Angeles, Calif.*: Lymanhouse [1940]. vi, 215 pp. \$3.50.

Klarmann, Adolf D., and Gorr, Adolph C.—German Readings and Composition based on the History of German Civilization. *New York*: Harper & Brothers [1940]. x, 180 pp. \$1.50.

Kehr, Charlotte.—Der deutsche Entwicklungsroman seit der Jahrhundertwende. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Entwicklungsromans. Diss. Leipzig. *Dresden*: Dittert, 1939. 127 pp. M. 2.85.

Koch, Franz.—Geist und Leben. Vorträge und Aufsätze. *Hamburg*: Hanseatische Verlags-Anstalt [1939]. 239 pp. M. 7.50.

Krämer, Rudolf.—Rilke und Bachofen. Diss. Frankfurt. *Würzburg*: K. J. Triltsch, 1939. 95 pp.

Lange, Victor.—Deutsche Briefe, Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. *New York*: Crofts & Co., 1940. ix, 297 pp. \$1.50.

Linden, Walther.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 2. erw. Aufl. *Leipzig*: Reclam [1940]. 528 pp., 24 leaves. M. 6.

Magnusson, Erik Rudolf.—Syntax des Prädikatsverbuns im Mittelniederdeutschen von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts. Diss. [Lunder germanistische Forschungen. 8]. *Lund*: C. W. K. Gleerup [1939]. xii, 203 pp. Kr. 8.

Miller, Edmund Erskine.—Zur Textgeschichte von Wielands Agathon. Diss. Teil-druck. *Baltimore, Md.*: The Johns Hopkins Univ. 1933. 39 pp.

Neuse, Werner.—Heitere Geschichten. A Grammar Review with oral and written exercises. *New York*: W. W. Norton & Co. [1940]. x, 256 pp. \$1.65.

Reimann, Hans Joachim.—Die Familie in Jeremias Gotthelfs Dichtungen. Diss. Berlin. [Stadion, Bd. 4]. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1939. 78 pp. M. 2.70.

Russon, L. J.—Spas muss sein. [Oxford rapid-reading German texts based on word-frequency]. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1939. 44 pp. \$0.30.

Schuchard, Hans-Karl.—Der Minnesänger Otto von Botenlauben. Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania. *Philadelphia*: 1940. 89 pp.

Soeteman, Cornelis.—Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungstechnik Oftrid von Weisenburgs. Academicum Proefschrift. *Groningen*: 1939. 5 leaves, 132 pp.

Spann, Meno, and Fehling, Fred L.—Functional German Grammar. *New York*: Harper & Brothers, 1940. x, 339 pp. \$1.60.

Werner, Zacharias.—Die Tagebücher des Dichters Zacharias Werner. (Texte). Hrg. u. erl. von Oswald Floeck. [Bibl. d. litt. Ver. in Stuttgart, Publ. 289]. *Leipzig*: Hiersemann, 1939. xxxviii, 261 pp. M. 15.

Wocke, Helmut.—Rilke und Italien. Mit Benutzung ungedruckter Quellen dargestellt. Diss. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 73]. *Giessen*: von Münchow, 1940. 167 pp. M. 5.50.

Zwick, M.—Das schwarze Segel. Adapted by H. D. Samuel. Authorized Edition. [Oxford rapid-reading German texts based on word-frequency]. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1939. 48 pp. \$0.30.

FRENCH

Buchanan, D. W.—Les Sentiments religieux de V. Hugo de 1825 à 1848. Paris diss., 1939. 240 pp.

Césari, Paul.—Etude critique des passions dans l'œuvre de Balzac. Paris diss., 1938. 212 pp.

Chevalier, Alice.—Rulhière, J.-J. Rousseau et la Comédie de caractère de 1770 à 1778. Paris diss., 1939. 173 pp.

Duhamel, G.—Les jeunes de Vallangou-jard, ed. M. E. Storer. *Boston*: Heath, 1940. xviii + 183 pp.

Fogelberg, Thelma.—La Langue et le style de Paul Adam. Paris diss., 1939. 239 pp.

George, A. J.—Lamartine and Romantic Unanimism. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. 200 pp. \$2.25.

Guberina, Petar.—Valeur logique des propositions complexes en français et en serbo-croate. Paris diss. *Zagreb*: 1939. 350 pp.

Jehan de le Mote.—La Voie d'enfer et de paradis, an unpub. poem of the fourteenth century, pub. by Sister M. A. Petty. Catholic U. diss., 1940. viii + 186 pp.

Joppin, Gabriel.—Fénelon et le mystique du pur amour. Bordeaux diss., 1938. 304 pp.

— Une Querelle autour de l'amour pur, J.-P. Camus. Bordeaux diss., 1938. 132 pp.

Kany and Dondo.—Elementary Fr. conversation. *Boston*: Heath (1940). viii + 54 pp.

Karraker, I. O., Jr.—Pierre de Nolhac. Abstract of U. of Ill. diss., 1940. 14 pp.

Kinne, W. A.—Revivals and importations of Fr. comedies in England, 1749-1800. Columbia diss. *Cincinnati*: 1939. xvi + 311 pp.

Leblanc, M.—Des Pas sur la neige, ed. J. B. and M. L. Dale. *Boston*: Heath (1940). viii + 86 pp.

Lucas, Harry.—Les Poésies personnelles de Rutebeuf. Strasbourg diss., 1938. 137 pp.

O'Hara, F. P.—Claude Tillier, sa vie et ses œuvres. Paris diss., 1939. 332 pp.

Raffetto, Rita.—L'Evolution du roman de P. Bourget. Toulouse diss., 1938. 173 pp.

Ralph, Dorothy M.—Jean de Meun. Abstract of U. of Ill. diss., 1940. 7 pp.

Roberts, E. C.—The Educational ideas of A. France. Abstract of U. of Ill. diss., 1940. 15 pp.

Sivasriyananda, W.—L'Epicurisme de La Rochefoucauld. Paris diss., 1939. 222 pp.

Williams, E. E.—Racine depuis 1885, bibliog. raisonnée, 1885-1939. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. 279 pp. \$2.75.

ITALIAN

Flora, Fr.—Foscolo. *Milano*: S. E. N., 1940. 136 pp. L. 10.

— Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. I: Dal Medio Evo alla fine del Quattrocento. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1940. 616 pp. L. 22.

Gentile, Giovanni.—Il pensiero italiano nel Rinascimento. 3a ediz. accresciuta e riordinata. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1940. xii + 432 pp. L. 35.

Goretta, M.—Verga-Goethe-Ibsen. *Verona*: Edizioni "L'Albero," 1940. 108 pp. L. 8.

Grilli, A.—Panzini a Serra. *Bologna*: Ediz. del gruppo Scrittori S. I. A., 1940. 74 pp. L. 6.

Guittone D'Arezzo.—Le Rime, a cura di Fr. Egidi. ("Scrittori d'Italia," vol. 175). *Bari*: Laterza, 1940. 414 pp. L. 50.

Gustarelli, A.—Giuseppe Baretta. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1940. 96 pp. L. 4.

La Manna, Lavinia Caprio.—Readings in Italian. A Bibliography of Materials, etc. ("Reading for Background, no. 13"). *New York*: H. W. Wilson Co., 1940. 46 pp. \$0.35.

Marineo Siculo, Lucio.—Epistolario, a cura di Pietro Verrua. (Biblioteca rara, Quarta Serie, n. LXXXIV). *Genova*: Soc. An. Ed. Dante Alighieri, 1940. 218 pp. L. 18.

Moscardelli, N. (ed).—Le più belle liriche italiane dell'anno 1939 scelte da N. Moscardelli. *Roma*: Libr. Internaz. "Modernissima," 1940. 120 pp. L. 15, 75.

Parini, G.—Il Giorno e Odi scelte, con introd. e commento di B. Migliore. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1940. xxvi + 344 pp. con 8 tavv. L. 12.

Roncari, A. e Brighenti, C.—La lingua italiana insegnata agli stranieri. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1940. 260 pp. L. 16.

Saponaro, M.—Carducci. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1940. 458 pp. con 24 ritr. e 2 lettere autografe. Leg. L. 30.

Sorge, Maria.—De Belli a Trilussa. La portée humaine de la poésie en dialecte romain. Thèse pour le Doctorat d'Université, Faculté des lettres, Université de Paris. *Paris*: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. 288 pp.

Zoppi, G.—Antologia della letteratura italiana, ad uso degli stranieri. Vol. II: Scrittori dell'Ottocento. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1940. 704 pp. L. 40. (rileg. L. 50.)

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Arona, J. de.—Diccionario de peruanismos. *Paris*: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1938. 399 pp.

Calbick, G. S.—A Critical Text of la Gran Conquista de Ultramar, Chap. CCLXIV. Part of U. of Chicago diss., 1940. 8 pp.

Castillo & Sparkman.—En Guatemala. Lecturas compuestas y arregladas. *Boston*: Heath (1940). iv + 58 pp.

Cornejo, J.—Fuera del diccionario (Unas 3000 voces i acepciones que no constan en el léxico oficial castellano). *Quito*: Ministerio de Gobierno, 1938. xix + 341 pp.

Diez-Canedo, E.—El teatro y sus enemigos. *Mexico*: La Casa de España, 1939. 163 pp.

Gosnell, C. F.—Sp. Personal Names. *New York*: Wilson, 1938. xi + 112 pp.

Marasso, A.—Cervantes y Virgilio. *Buenos Aires*: Inst. Cultural González, 1937. 169 pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—La España del Cid. *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1939. 508 pp.

Recouly, R.—Le Chasseur de nuées, ou la vie de Cervantès. *Paris*: Ed. de Fr., 1938. ix + 267 pp.

Reyes, A.—Capítulos de literatura española. *Mexico*: La Casa de España, 1939. vi + 317 pp.

Ribeiro, J.—Estética da lingua portuguesa. *Rio de Janeiro*: ANoite. 308 pp.

Röhner, K.—Beschreibende Phonetik der Mundart von Cachopo. *Winterthur*: Buchdr. Winterthur, 1938. 59 pp.

Salinas, Pedro.—Truth of Two and other poems. Translations by Eleanor L. Turnbull. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. x + 289 pp. \$2.75.

Trinker, M. K. de.—Las mujeres en el D. Quijote de Cervantes comp. con las muj. en los dramas de Shakespeare. *Mexico*: Edit. Cultura, 1938. 115 pp.

Weisinger, Nina L.—A Guide to studies in Sp. American lit. *Boston*: Heath (1940). vi + 120 pp.

GENERAL

Abstracts of dissertations, ed. H. W. Hill. *Los Angeles*: U. of S. Cal. Press, 1940. 180 pp. (U. of S. Cal. Chronicles Series.)

Carcopino, J.—Daily Life in Ancient Rome, ed. H. T. Rowell, trans. E. O. Lorimer. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1940. xv + 342 pp. \$4.00.

Cook, Olan V.—Incunabula in the Hanes Collection of the Library of the U. of N. C. *Chapel Hill*: 1940. 126 pp. \$3.00.

Deferrari, R. J., Sister M. W. Fanning, Sister A. S. Sullivan.—A Concordance of Lucan. *Washington*: Catholic U., 1940. viii + 602 pp. (lithotyped). \$6.50.

Erhardt-Siebold, Erika and Rudolf von.—Cosmology in the "Annotationes in Marcianum." *Baltimore*: Williams & Wilkins, 1940. 45 pp. \$1.25.

Gustafson, Alrik.—Six Scandinavian Novelists: Lie, Jacobsen, Heidenstam, Selma Lagerlöf, Hamsun, Sigrid Unset. *Princeton*: University Press, 1940. 367 pp. \$3.50.

Ibsen.—Peer Gynt, trans. R. Ellis Roberts. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press (1940). xxx + 276 pp. \$0.80.

Macurdy, Grace.—The Quality of Mercy, the gentler virtues in Greek literature. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1940. xiv + 185 pp. \$2.00.

Simmons, E. J.—Dostoevski, the making of a novelist. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. x + 416 pp. \$3.00.

Williams, E. E.—Tragedy of Destiny, Oedipus Tyrannus, Macbeth, Athalia. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Eds. XVII siècle, 1940. 35 pp. \$0.80.

Wood, F. T.—Eddie Lays, selected and ed. [author, U. of Va.], 1940. vi + 227 pp.

2
i
-
-
n
t
:
.
s
y,
o
o.
g
s,
y,
-
o.
l.

DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI'S
LETTERS TO FANNY
CORNFORTH

EDITED BY PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM

It has always been known that Fanny Cornforth—whose real name was Sarah Cox, until she married Timothy Hughes—was an important influence in Rossetti's life. She was one of his best models when he was beginning his most characteristic three-quarter-length figure pictures, and next to Mrs. Morris she appears most frequently in his best paintings. She was probably his mistress both before and after his marriage. Not much was revealed about her, however, in the books and articles written by those who actually knew her, and that little was meant, by indirection and innuendo, to give the impression that she was an altogether maleficent influence on his life and his art. Rossetti's family and friends disliked her intensely, doubtless with good reason, as it seemed to them. But Rossetti himself had a genuine profound affection for her, which these letters make perfectly clear.

xiii + 142 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$2.25

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

**THE OLD GERMANIC PRINCIPLES OF
NAME-GIVING**

BY

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

*Assistant Professor of English
Louisiana State University*

This study falls into two parts, one concerned with the naming of those Germanic tribes who migrated to England, the other with those who remained on the Continent. After an introduction are to be found chapters on the royal families of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Lindsey, Mercia, Bernicia, Deira, and Wessex. Then follows a long chapter dealing with the Old English non-royal families, in which an attempt is made to find out in what ways the names of those not of the royal blood differ from those of their rulers. The next chapter, which treats Old English poetry, is in the main a consideration of the Beowulfian genealogies. Chapters on the Scandinavians, the Merovingians, the Goths, the Langobards, the Burgundians and some others, together with a conclusion, complete the volume. There is a bibliography, and an extensive index of names.

xii + 299 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$4.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

New Intermediate French Texts

Dumas' LES TROIS MOUSQUETAIRES

Adapted to a vocabulary level of 2160 words. Notes in French. Especially interesting exercises. Simplified and edited by

HENRIETTE R. KOLLEWIJN • ALGERNON COLEMAN

SCIENCE FRANÇAISE

A varied, modern selection from writings in the fields of the social and the natural sciences. Careful grading and vocabulary building. Collection "Arts et Sciences" in the Heath-Chicago Series. Simplified and edited by

ERNEST F. HADEN • R. C. TROTTER

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

February Publication

FRENCH POEMS

A. G. CANFIELD AND WARNER F. PATTERSON
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A complete revision of the author's *French Lyrics* to serve as an introduction to the reading and study of French poetry. Selections are classified by genre—narrative poems are included and much new material from the nineteenth and twentieth century has been added.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Probable Price \$1.75

HOLT

257 FOURTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

2

S
ON

ve
ch
ms
th

RK